

DA
696
C3B86
1899

HANDBOOK FOR CANTERBURY



British Association
DOVER 1899

DA
690
C3 B86
1899

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



FROM
E. L. Nichols

Cornell University Library
DA 690.C3B86 1899

Handbook to the city of Canterbury ...



3 1924 028 079 295

01n



Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT
OF SCIENCE.

DOVER MEETING,
1899.

HANDBOOK
TO THE
CITY OF CANTERBURY.

Canterbury the head city of all that country.—

LAMBARDE.

EDITED BY—
SEBASTIAN EVANS, LL.D.
AND
FRANK BENNETT GOLDNEY,
Hon. Curator of the Royal Museum.

Printed at the "Observer" Office, 144, Snargate Street, Dover.

W.L.

W

A764221

Of the Papers included in this Handbook, those on the
Cathedral and its Chronological History are by

THE VERY REVEREND
F. W. FARRAR, D.D.,
Dean of Canterbury.

That on St. Augustine's Abbey, by

W. H. ST. JOHN HOPE, Esq., M.A.,

And those on St. Pancras and St. Martin by

THE REVEREND CANON
C. F. ROUTLEDGE, M.A.

The rest are by

THE EDITORS.

PREFACE.

THIS HANDBOOK has been specially prepared for the use of those Members of the British Association who may visit Canterbury during the Dover Meeting.

The names of the DEAN OF CANTERBURY, CANON ROUTLEDGE, and Mr. ST. JOHN HOPE, are a sufficient guarantee that a great portion of the work will be found of permanent value. In cordially thanking these gentlemen for their kind assistance, the Editors desire to add that their collaboration in the present volume in no way implies their concurrence or acquiescence in any of the opinions expressed by the Editors themselves, many of which are at variance with those more generally accepted.

15, WATERLOO CRESCENT,
DOVER.

CONTENTS.

		PAGE
EARLY HISTORY	5.
KENT AND CÆSAR	9
THE SAXON INVASION	19
THE CATHEDRAL	28
CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY	40
ST. AUGUSTINE'S ABBEY	43
ST. PANCRAS	48
ST. MARTIN'S	50
OTHER CHURCHES	54
FRIARIES, ETC.	58
MEDIÆVAL HISTORY, KING ETHELBERT	60
HENGIST AND HORSA	62
THE BRETWALDA	62
CANTERBURY AND CONSTANTINOPLE	63
EARLY ENGLISH CHRISTIANITY	65
THE MINT	67
THE LAWS OF KENT	69
GAVELKIND	71
THE MAYOR AND COMMONALTY	74
PILGRIMAGES	77
THE RIVER STOUR	79
THE CITY WALLS	80
THE CITY GATES	80
THE CASTLE	82
THE DANE JOHN	82
THE MARTYRS' FIELD	84
THE HOSPITALS	86
THE JEWRY	88
CHRISTCHURCH GATE	92
THE ARCHBISHOPS' PALACE	92
THE GUILDHALL	93
MARKETS AND FAIRS	94
INNS	94
TRADES	94
THE KING'S SCHOOL	95
THE ROYAL MUSEUM	96
THE FREE LIBRARY	99

CANTERBURY.

EARLY HISTORY.

AVE, MATER ANGLIÆ! Of right may Canterbury claim the august and venerable title. Whether we accept the usually accredited account of the so-called "Saxon invasion" in the fifth century, or the soberer facts of more scientific history, we cannot refuse to regard Kent as the cradle of our race, and Canterbury—the Cant-warabyrig—as the Mother-city of the English Empire. It was here that the English race first founded a settled home on English soil, here that English commerce established its first permanent centre, here that the "common speech" of a people, mainly Belgic, but mingled with many other elements, first became a mercantile *lingua franca*, intelligible to the traders of many lands, in due time to be shaped into the noblest engine of human thought, the English language.

I do not propose to enter into any discussion with regard to the succession of palæolithic, neolithic, or bronze-age peoples who inhabited this part of our island in pre-historic days. Here it will be enough to point out that after Britain became an island the movements of the successive peoples that occupied it must have been determined by two dominant factors. The first is, that populations on the move, like other bodies, follow the line of least resistance, and consequently, that the races which came from the Continent to Britain crossed the Channel where it is easiest to cross. Incursions there may have been, and doubtless were, of small bodies of foreigners from other shores than those of Gaul to accessible parts of

our coast other than those of Kent. But any immigration on a large scale and extending over a long period—any invasion, not of an army but of a people with their wives, children, and belongings, must of necessity have landed on our south-east coast, and must equally of necessity, have pushed the tribes formerly in possession away from the centre of dispersion at the spot where they landed. The second factor is equally simple. At every step forward in civilisation, the individual requires a less amount of territory on which to find subsistence. In other words, the same amount of land will support a larger population. As he advances towards civilisation, man is first a hunter, then a herdsman, then a ploughman, then a merchant. More herdsmen than hunters can subsist on an equal area, more ploughmen than herdsmen, more merchants than ploughmen. Wherever tribes belonging to the several stages are in contact, therefore, the mere relative increase of population sooner or later compels the herdsman to encroach upon the territory of the hunter, the ploughman upon that of herdsman and hunter, and the merchant upon that of all three others. In the Britain that Cæsar found were four peoples, roughly corresponding to these four stages of civilization. The first of these—though very far from being the first inhabitants of these islands—belonged probably to a race which has been called Iberic. Their ancestors were hunters, unacquainted with the use of metals, and must have crossed the Channel at a period of incalculable antiquity. Upon the heels of these a second race, mainly herdsmen, had followed across the narrow seas, upon both sides of which they were then settled. These were Celts of the earlier Gaelic branch of that ubiquitous folk, the forefathers of the Gael and the Irish. After them, the later Celt, the ploughman ancestor of the Cornish, Welsh, and mediæval Cumbrian followed, driving his predecessors away before him inland and westward from the south-east shore. The Welshman, if the name may be given by anticipation, had, in his turn, been supplanted on the south-east coast by the Belgic merchant probably more than two centuries before the days of Cæsar, during which time the newcomer had contrived to make himself master of a huge tract of

territory, stretching, possibly, even at this early time, in an irregular line from the Wash on the east coast to Studland Bay on the south.

Assuming, then, as we are entitled to assume, that the various peoples which successively immigrated into our island crossed from the Continent by the Straits of Dover, it follows that at the time they crossed they must have occupied the territory on both sides of the Straits, and that each in turn must have been thrust away from their "straits settlements" on the Continental side before the people that followed them could make any successful incursion on British soil. Professor Boyd Dawkins has shown good reason for believing that in some far distant period of past ages some of the inhabitants of these islands found a refuge from the encroachments of more advanced populations by retreating northward and eastward. Long before the dawn of history this way of escape was practically closed. In somewhat later days, the thrust of advancing populations drove the less civilised before them along the seashore to the west and south. It is not without significance that we find the descendant of the Iberian in the Spanish Peninsula, of the Gaelic Celt in Aquitania, of the Welsh Celt in Brittany, and the Belgic tribes in north-west Gaul, along the Continental side of the Manche as well as on the British coast before the days of Cæsar.

It is with the immigration of these Belgic tribes into Britain that the history of England, Kent and Canterbury really begins, and he who first placed our earliest history on record was happily not only the first of Roman Emperors, but the greatest and most authoritative of early historians, an eye-witness of much that he relates, a careful observer, and a diligent enquirer, to whom it was always a matter of primary personal importance to know the truth, and often of hardly less importance to tell it. Cæsar, it is true, makes no mention of England or Canterbury by name, as he does make mention of Kent, but I hope to show that both the one and the other are distinctly recognisable in his narrative. Indeed, had he mentioned Canterbury by name at all, it would probably have been by the name of *Durovernum*, by which it was known at the time when the

Antonine Itinerary was compiled some three centuries and a half later. As was the case with many another city throughout what gradually became the Roman Empire, the old local name was supplanted by that of the "state" whose capital it was. In the list given by the geographer of Ravenna, it still appears as "Duroaverno Cantiacorum," while in contemporary native records it is simply "Cantwarabyrig." But, let it be noted, the name of the people who gave the later name to the city was unchanged from the first. Cæsar calls the territory itself "Cantium," or Kent, the people were "Cantiaci," the men of Kent, as the Ravenna geographer calls them, or as Ptolemy—about A.D. 100 calls them in Greek, "Kantioi." In fact, ever since the Belgic settlers found a home in Britain, some two and twenty centuries ago, Kent has been Kent, the "cant," or corner, or angle of the island. Philologists have discussed the question in what languages the word "cant" means a corner. It certainly meant it in the language of the Belgic folk, even if it was not confined to their tongue. To this day, the charts of the English shore show a little to the north-east of Sheppey Island, "the Cant," or corner, where vessels from the Thames begin to "cant" toward the south-east. That the "Cant," or corner of Britain, would be translated by the Romans as "angulus," or angle, was inevitable, and, indeed, Cæsar himself calls Kent an "angulus" of Britain. However fanciful and absurd may be some of the philological speculations of Bede and others, certainly the belief that the Angul Saxons—for this seems to be the earliest form of the word—derived their name from their being at the time the name was first given settled in the "Angulus" of England, or Kent, is apparently well-founded. Nor need it disturb this conclusion to find that there are other Angles over sea from whom our English Angles on wholly untrustworthy authority are supposed to have derived their ancestry. "Angul" is a word—one out of very many—borrowed from the Romans by the "Angul-Saxons," and means a "hook." To "fish with an angle" still means to fish with a hook," and if we find "Angles" long settled about the modern "Hook of Holland," or other localities where the coast-line forms an "angle" of the

same kind, and where the language of the people is closely allied to our own, we need feel no qualms in believing that analogous circumstances may have given rise to a similarly analogous national name. That by the time of Bede the "Angles" are located beyond the limits of Kent simply proves what is known on other grounds to be true, that the original "Angles" of Kent were pushed away from their first home by the arrival of other immigrants from the Continent. The case, indeed, is very much the same as that of Northumberland in later days. Yorkshire and Durham now lie between the county and the Humber to the banks of which it formerly extended. That "Kent" meant an angle or corner, and that the "Angul-Saxons" were originally settled in Kent are facts which it would be difficult indeed to dispute. The word "Durovernum" itself is almost as certainly Celtic, signifying "the Stronghold in the Marsh," an accurately descriptive name for such a place as it must have been in the days already immemorial before the coming of Cæsar, when Kent, then in all probability known by another name, itself was Celtic.

KENT AND CÆSAR.

Cæsar's consummate strategy throughout his Gaulish and British campaigns has somewhat overshadowed his equally consummate policy. Barbaric and brutal as his methods were on only too many occasions, they were never adopted from mere lust of conquest or bloodshed. His main object, no doubt, was the extension of the Roman Empire, but none knew better than he that the strength and permanence of the Roman Empire depended ultimately on the extent and freedom of Roman commerce. His hunger for trade was a deeper instinct than his hunger for territory, and his descents on Britain, almost always ascribed to mere desire of conquest and glory, were, as a matter of fact, conducted with a keen eye to business. The old trade route between Cornwall and Marseille, and, indeed, between Britain generally and the Mediterranean markets, was probably by way of Thanet and south-east Kent to the Gironde, and

thence by the Garonne to Narbonne on the Mediterranean shore. At a somewhat later date, the Loire became the great highway, as far as it was navigable. From the highest point of the Loire accessible by the merchant vessels of the time, the traffic passed by land across a part of the Lyonnais to Macon or Lyon, and thence down the Rhone. This later route gave a waterway almost the whole distance, and passed through the very heart of Gaul. Both routes avoided the dangers of the Bay of Biscay and the tedious voyage round the Spanish Peninsula, but the great difficulty of both was the perilous coasting passage round the treacherous iron-bound shores of Brittany. By the time that the Gallic "Province" became part of the Roman Empire, Marseille no longer monopolised the trade with the north and west. An overland journey, moreover, was no longer so risky an enterprise as it had been for many ages previously. The shortest line of traffic between Rome and Britain would be by Genoa and Turin, and thence south of the lake of Geneva, by Dijon, Troyes, Soissons, Amiens, and Boulogne.

This fact must have been strongly impressed on Cæsar's mind in the course of his early Gallic campaigns, and his policy of safeguarding the passes to the south of the lake of Geneva was probably dictated as much by his appreciation of the value of the direct line to Britain as by the more immediate expediency of securing an overland route between Rome and Gaul generally. For it must be remembered that in his day an exaggerated importance was attached to the value of the commerce with Britain. To the Roman world it was still a *terra incognita*, and it was believed to be an island Eldorado.

The great practical difficulty, however, in establishing a safe and satisfactory overland route between Britain and Italy was the existence of an effective commercial *cordon* all along the Continental shores from the embouchure of the Loire to that of the Rhine. The Veneti of Brittany were the power that maintained this *cordon*. They still held by far the greatest portion of the carrying trade with Britain in their own hands, and they levied a heavy toll on the comparatively small proportion that remained in the hands of other "states." The Belgæ who had pushed the Veneti

westward from the Straits of Dover were more powerful on land but less powerful on the sea, and were content to pay tribute to the Veneti for the right to carry merchandise between their own ports and Britain. It is perfectly intelligible, therefore, on the one hand, why Cæsar should be bent on establishing a direct highway between Rome and Britain, and on the other, why the Veneti should resist so serious an encroachment on their national monopoly. The confederation organised by the Veneti, the Armorican league, was perhaps the most formidable than even Cæsar ever encountered. But he knew how to meet it. The sailing-ships of the Veneti were the best afloat, and it incidentally appears that they made use of iron bolts and chain-cables while the Romans still employed bronze fittings and hempen ropes. Cæsar built galleys and requisitioned slaves to row them from among the Belgic and other "states" which were at his mercy. The result answered his expectations. The great naval encounter took place in a dead calm, when the 220 vessels of the Veneti fell a helpless prey to "the steamships of antiquity," the Roman galleys. Completely worsted, the Veneti and their allies surrendered themselves and their possessions to Cæsar. He put all their senate to death, and sold the rest of the people as slaves. Of the terrible Venetic league, only the Morini in the neighbourhood of Boulogne, and the Menapii, still nearer the mouth of the Rhine, remained in arms.

The next year was the memorable B.C. 55. The new highway to Britain was practically open, and the next great enterprise was the subjugation of Britain itself. But an unexpected hindrance occurred. Two German tribes on the right bank of the Rhine had been forced to cross the river by the incursions of the Suevi, the strongest of the German "states." These two tribes, after defeating the Menapii, had wintered in their country, and sundry of the Belgic "states," among whom probably were the Morini, had sent them urgent messages to come to their assistance against the Roman armies. Other German tribes were hastening in the same direction. A battle ensued under circumstances which Cato in the Roman senate afterwards denounced as treacherous on the part of Cæsar, but which

the conqueror himself details with much complacency. The number of the slain, including women and children, he estimates at 430,000, some killed by soldiers, the rest drowned near the confluence of the Meuse and the Rhine. It was still necessary to prevent the possibility of a German advance along the shores of Belgic Gaul, which might intercept his return, and perhaps cut off his retreat from Britain. Cæsar bridged the Rhine, and spent eighteen days on the German side.

The road to Britain was now clear, but the eventful voyage was not to be undertaken without full enquiry as to what reception might be expected on the British side of the Channel. Nearly all that Cæsar knew of our Island up to this time was that many of those he defeated in Gaul found a refuge in Britain, and that in almost every war with the Gauls, contingents from Britain had fought against him. He catechised the merchants who traded to our shores. He might as well have catechised the codfish of the Channel. They were unanimous in their determination to know nothing even about their own business. Failing to elicit any information from the British commercial traveller, he despatched the trusty Caius Volusenus in a ship of war to reconnoitre and report at the earliest possible day. He himself advanced to "the Morini," probably Boulogne, with all his forces, among which the Roman legionaries were only a small minority. All the ships from all the ports along the Belgic and Armorican shore were summoned for the transport of his armies, and the maritime population that survived the extinction of the Veneti and had been sold into slavery, supplied able-bodied seamen, willing or unwilling, in abundance.

Meanwhile, the commercial gentlemen whom Cæsar had found so reticent had contrived to convey to Britain full information as to what was going forward. In a few days, envoys arrived from several of the British "states," announcing the willingness of their chiefs to submit to Cæsar and Rome, and to give hostages for their good behaviour. Cæsar received them courteously, and sent them back to Britain with much good advice and a distinguished escort. After his victory over the alliance of

Belgic "states" in Gaul, among which the Atrebates, or people of Arras, were the most influential, he had created Commius, one of their own chiefs, King over the survivors of the tribe. Commius, whose army now formed part of the assembled auxiliary forces, was known to possess great influence with the Belgic "states" of Britain, as well as with those of Gaul. He was accordingly told off to accompany the envoys on their return, with orders to visit as many of the British "States" as he could, and induce them to accept the "protection" of Rome. A guard of thirty horse and probably a small force of infantry accompanied the royal envoy.

The story of Cæsar's first landing in Britain has been told a thousand times, and need not here be repeated. The difficulty of approaching the shore, the heroism of the Romans, the resistance and ultimate flight of the Britons are detailed in every history, and the controversy as to the place where the landing was effected has created an extensive literature of its own. For the present, it need only be noted that after this first victory, which, for all that Cæsar says, may have been absolutely bloodless, a number of envoys were hurriedly despatched to Cæsar to discuss terms of peace. With them came Commius of Arras. He had been seized, he said, on his arrival in Britain, and thrown into chains. Just at this juncture Commius was indispensable to Cæsar. If Cæsar knew he was lying, he could not do otherwise than accept his excuse for not having fulfilled his commission. We shall meet Commius again in Kent in later days, but I need not linger over the details of this first "invasion" of Britain.

The real invasion took place the following year, B.C. 54. On this second occasion, by the time Cæsar arrived on the Gallic side of the Channel, 600 new transport vessels had been built after designs of his own, and were nearly ready to be launched, besides 28 warships. The entire fleet were commanded to assemble at Portus Itius, now probably Wissant or Boulogne, while Cæsar himself marched towards Trèves, where a quarrel between two native chiefs demanded his interposition.

On his return to the seaboard, he found that 40 ships had been hindered by contrary winds, but that all the rest were ready and waiting to set sail. Four thousand cavalry troops were there, and also the chief persons of all the states. "He decided," the narrative continues, "to leave in Gaul only a very few of them, whose loyalty towards himself he had fully tested, and to take the rest with him as hostages." No doubt the fear of commotions in Gaul was one of his motives. Another, more powerful, he leaves to be inferred. The new transport ships were doubtless capable of carrying at least as many men as the old ones of the year before. Two of these we are incidentally told carried 300 men, so we may fairly conclude that each of the new build would carry 150. Fifty of the new vessels may have been required for carrying over the 2,000 cavalry. He had, therefore, in his 600 new vessels alone, transport for 84,500 troops. Besides these, however, he had 28 new warships, and he reckons that, including the vessels employed in the preceding year, and the ships fitted out by private individuals for their own convenience, his fleet amounted to no less than 800 sail. The most moderate estimate of the force with which he landed in Britain can therefore hardly be less than 100,000, and was probably largely in excess of that number.

Now the actual Roman army that Cæsar took with him amounted only to five legions of foot and two thousand horse. The normal legion of Cæsar's time was 5,000. The entire Roman force therefore was about 25,000 men and 2,000 horses. Cæsar, therefore, had carefully provided transport for some 73,000 men at least who were not Roman. He himself tells us that he took with him all the chief men of "all the tribes" of Gaul as hostages for their own fidelity, and that of all the tribes thus summarily deprived of all their native leaders. But upon what conditions was this high-handed proceeding physically possible? Some, perhaps many, of these hostages were unwilling companions, and felt the compulsory voyage into Britain a hardship and an indignity. But they cannot have been prisoners. On the one hand, Cæsar would never dream of carting about many hundreds, if not some

thousands, of Gallic state-prisoners and telling off a still larger number of his own men to keep watch and ward over them when starting on a campaign in an unknown country. On the other hand, to have carried off into captivity, or even to have treated in a manner unbecoming their dignity the native royalties and nobilities of Gaul, would have provoked rebellion in Gaul before the fleet had reached the shores of Britain, for large as was the number of hostages, there must have been many nobles left behind who would have been only too glad to become the leaders of the national movement. It is, in fact, nothing less than a necessary inference that these chiefs held an honourable position, that they were led to expect some advantage to themselves as a result of the expedition, that no national insult to the tribes was implied in taking them. But if this be so, the further inference is unavoidable, that they were really the leaders and captains of the auxiliary forces which accompanied the expedition. The Gallic "states," it is abundantly clear, were in the habit—some of them under the necessity—of hiring out their armies to any power willing and able to pay them. When Cæsar tells us that he took with him the native chiefs and nobility of "all the tribes," is it credible that he would leave all their armies in full strength behind while he took five legions of his Romans into Britain? On the other hand, in Britain there was an alluring prospect of unlimited loot for any number of mercenaries, and if the prospective plunder should fall short, there were plenty of tribes who could be sold into slavery to supply the deficiency. Cæsar almost invariably ignores his employment of mercenaries and their services to his army, but in this case, when he tells us that he took the chiefs of the several mercenary armies with him, there was really no need to announce that the armies accompanied the chiefs. It was an inference he gave his readers credit for being able to draw for themselves.

The method adopted comes out clearly enough in the narrative of what took place immediately before the start. Among the hostage chieftains was Dumnorix the *Æduan*. When Cæsar first insisted on Dumnorix accompanying him, the *Æduan* petitioned to be left in Gaul. He was not a

good sailor, he said, and was afraid of the passage across the Channel. Besides, he had presentiments of bad luck, and entertained conscientious objections to taking the voyage. When he found that Cæsar disregarded equally his liver and his conscience, he changed his tactics, and began to intrigue with others of the hostages to induce them to stay behind with him. It is significant that he failed to find a single one to agree with him. All but himself regarded it as better business to go than to stay. Twenty-five days passed and the order was given to embark. Just at the critical moment it was discovered that Dumnorix and his cavalry had disappeared. The mention of the Æduan cavalry in this connexion is decisive as to their forming part of the auxiliary army. Cæsar sent "a great part" of his own cavalry to bring back the fugitive, or, if he still refused, to slay him. He refused and was slain, "but the Æduan cavalry all return to Cæsar."

At last the mighty fleet got under way. The vessels started at sunset, probably from Boulogne and the immediate neighbourhood, with a gentle breeze from the south-west. About midnight the wind dropped, and the tide carried them so far up channel that when the sun rose they saw that they had passed Britain on the left. In other words, they found themselves a little to the north-east of the North Foreland. After the tide had turned, and the current began to bear them down channel, the rowers were set to work to take the ships in shore at the point where Cæsar landed the year before. This clearly indicates some part of the shore between Ramsgate and Dover as the point of debarkation, and the coast near Deal seems that which best suits with the particulars recorded. In fact, "all in the Downs the fleet was moored."

The sight of 800 vessels bearing down on the coast at once produced its natural effect. Not an enemy was to be seen, and the vast army disembarked undisturbed. At nightfall, Cæsar "moved forward a distance of about 12 miles, when the troops of the enemy appeared in sight. They advanced with their cavalry and war chariots to the river and began to check our men, engaging

with them from the higher ground. When they were repulsed by our cavalry, they hid themselves in the forest, where they held a position admirably fortified both by nature and art. This, it appeared, had lately been set in order on account of a tribal war, for all the entrances to it were barricaded with a number of felled trees. They themselves sallied out of the woods in small detachments, and prevented our men entering the fortifications. The soldiers of the seventh legion, however, formed a *testudo*, threw up a bank against the fortifications and took the place, driving the enemy out of the woods, only a few of our men being wounded. Cæsar, however, forbade his men to pursue their flight to any great distance, as he was unacquainted with the nature of the ground, and also because the day was already far spent, and he wished to allow time for fortifying the camp."

There can be little doubt that this "position, admirably fortified both by nature and art," is none other than Bigbury Camp in Bigbury Wood, and as little that in those days Bigbury was the *oppidum* of Canterbury then-known as Durovernum. Happily, Cæsar defines exactly what he means when he speaks of an *oppidum*. What the Britons call an *oppidum*, he says, is "a thickly-wooded position fortified by a vallum and an entrenchment within which they are wont to congregate in order to avoid an incursion of their enemies." Before the days of stone walls and fortifications, indeed, an *oppidum* in the near-neighbourhood of a town or city exposed to easy attack and consisting of highly inflammable huts and houses, was an institution of the highest practical utility. On occasions of threatened attack, the inhabitants could betake themselves with their flocks and herds to their stronghold, which was far more easily defensible than their own dwelling-places to which they could return when the danger was overpast. Obviously, Canterbury, even if surrounded by a vallum of earth, would be far more difficult to defend than Bigbury, which, although taken at once by a Cæsar, might probably have defied the attack of a Cassivellaunus.

"Canterbury," says Professor Boyd-Dawkins, in a letter he kindly sent me, "at the head of the navigation of the

Stour, stands, in my opinion, on a pre-historic site subsequently occupied by the Romans, the line of its former earthworks being preserved in the irregular shape of Roman Canterbury. That the city is approximately of the same date as the entrenchment known as Bigbury Camp seems to be proved by the fact that the Pilgrim's Road leading to Canterbury strikes right through the entrenchment. This is an *oppidum*, and obviously belongs to the same date as the road. That it dates from the Pre-historic Iron Age is proved by the iron implements and pottery which I obtained in it in 1893. The *oppidum* is one of many in Kent, and the Pilgrim's Road itself is merely a portion of the network of roads traversing England in the Pre-historic Iron Age. I would remark that the old road passed into the *oppidum* to the north of the place where it is marked on the six-inch map. It leaves the camp on the west as represented on the map."

Here, at Canterbury, I leave the "divine Julius" and his history, which for Britain, finally closes the Pre-historic Iron Age. Tacitus tells us that Cæsar's expedition was a survey of Britain rather than a conquest. Not a single Roman legion, not a single Roman officer, is recorded by Cæsar to have been left behind when he returned to Rome in triumph. But the task he had undertaken on both sides the Channel was none the less accomplished. He had opened and secured the pathways alike of conquest and commerce between Rome and Britain, and had made the princes of south-eastern Britain tributaries of Rome. But what of the 73,000 Belgic auxiliaries who accompanied the expedition? Their casualties, no doubt, would be heavier than those among the legionaries, but after making all allowances, an army would still be left larger than that which effected the Norman conquest. What became of them? There is no hint of their returning to their homes, and the natural inference is that they stayed where they were, in Britain. To me it seems that to leave them behind was the only rational policy that Cæsar could adopt. In Gaul, the Belgic chiefs and their armies were a standing menace to Roman predominance. In Britain, if only they were allowed a free hand to subjugate and plunder native

princes and territories outside the dominions of those who had already accepted Roman "protection," they would not only cease from troubling in Gaul, but would also be a security for the payment of the tribute imposed on the British princes as the price of "protection." Their obvious interests would lie in the payment of a tribute when the means of payment were placed in their hands without any burden to themselves, and when the payment of it left them free to pursue their own schemes of avarice or ambition. That some bargain of the kind was made by Cæsar with the Belgic auxiliaries he left behind him in Britain is almost certain. I entertain as little doubt that the conquests effected by these Belgic warriors formed a most momentous episode in the "Saxonizing" of Britain, a process which, according to nearly all our historians, did not even commence until five centuries later.

THE SAXON INVASION.

If I have dwelt at what may seem undue length on the expeditions of Cæsar to Britain, it is because I find it impossible not to believe that the Belgic tribes with which he came into such close contact were in reality our own forefathers, the true "Saxons" who transformed Celtic Britain into modern England, the Durovernum of the Pre-historic Iron Age into the Canterbury of to-day. The folk that constructed the earthworks at Bigbury, if a Belgic folk they were, seem to me the fathers and founders of the English people and the English language. Both race and tongue are products of our Kentish soil. The elements of both, no doubt, must be sought for beyond our shores, but both are none the less indigenous. Our daily bread is English, though the wheat may have grown at the Antipodes and the yeast been made in Germany. By the time that Britain emerges into real history in the pages of Cæsar, Kent and the surrounding districts are already English. Largely as the race has been modified by admixture with the immigrants and invaders of more than two millenniums, immensely as it has been

developed, and widely as it has been differentiated, it has never been dispossessed or denationalized. The hypothesis which assumes that English history begins with the incursion of certain peoples called Jutes, Angles, and Saxons in the fifth century, seems to me decisively negatived by all the evidence now available by the phenomena of our ancient institutions, our systems of agriculture, our local nomenclature, our arts and industries, our methods of government, our manners and customs, our laws and language.

The theory, indeed, can boast of a long and illustrious line of authorities in its favour, from the days of the Venerable Bede down to those of the late J. R. Green. But high as are the authorities, facts are higher still, and in this case, to my own mind, the facts are in direct contradiction to the authorities. When the story of the so-called Saxon invasion is traced back to its source, it is found to rest on the authority of two writers, one called Gildas or Gildus, and the other Nennius, or, perhaps, Mark. Gildas is said to have written about the year 560, but the latest researches seem to render it probable that this is about 50 years too early. He is said to have been a British writer by many authorities, by others to have been an Abbot in Britany, but the internal evidence seems to indicate that he was a brother in the monastery of St. Andrew's at Rome. As to Nennius, the evidence is even more conflicting. He may have written in the seventh century or in the tenth. All that is really known about the person so called is that his name, whatever it may have been, was not Nennius. These, be it observed, are the earliest known "authorities" on the subject.

The story they tell is worthy of historians so distinguished. The incoherent preachments of Gildas contain not a single definite statement, but he is of some value as evidence that some tradition in its main features similar to that recorded by Nennius was current in his day. The narrative of Nennius, so far as it relates to the invasion and Canterbury, runs thus: "Gorthigern was King in Britain, and while he reigned was sore troubled by dread of the Picts and Scots, by the Romanish attack and eke

by fear of Ambrosius. In the mean season came three chiules from Germany driven forth into exile, wherein were Hors and Hengist that were own brothers. But Gorthigern received them kindly, and delivered unto them the island that in their tongue is called Taneth, but in British speech, Ruithin. Martian the Second was reigning when the Saxons were received by Gorthigern in the year 447, after the passion of Christ. [The year apparently indicated by Nennius would therefore be A.D. 480.] Now it came to pass after the Saxons had pitched their camp in the aforesaid Isle of Taneth, the King aforesaid promised that victual and clothing should be given them without fail, and it pleased them, and they promised to fight against his enemies bravely. But those barbarians, when they were multiplied in number, the Britons were not able to feed them. When they asked for food and clothing, according as it had been promised them, the Britons said: 'We cannot give you food nor clothing, for that your number hath multiplied; but go forth from among us; your help we need not.' But they took counsel with their chief men to break the peace.

But Hengist, for that he was a learned man and keen of wit and crafty, when he had perceived as concerning the king that he was a sluggard, and as concerning his countrymen that they were wont to go about their business unarmed, forthwith began to hatch a politic scheme, and said to the British king; 'We be few. If thou wilt, we will send to our country that we may invite soldiers from among the soldiers of our land, and so shall the number be the greater to fight for thee and for thy people.' And the King granted him this same. They sent straightway, and the envoys voyaged athwart the Scythic Valley, returning with seventeen chiules. The chosen soldiers came in them, and in one chiule came a damsel exceeding fair and comely. This was the daughter of Hengist. After the chiules had come, Hengist made a feast to Gorthigern, the King and his soldiers, and to his interpreter who was called Cerdic selmet. Hengist, therefore, bade the damsel serve the wine and strong drink to them, and very drunken were they and full of liquor. And while they were

drinking, Satan entered into Gorthrigern's heart, so that he greatly loved the damsel and asked her of her father through his interpreter, and said : 'Everything that thou dost ask of me thou shalt obtain, even though it be the half of my kingdom.' And Hengist, taking counsel with his elders that had come with him from the island of Oghgul as to what they should ask of the King for the damsel, they all were of one counsel that they should ask for the tract of land that in their tongue is called Canthguaraland, but in our tongue, Chent. And he gave it to them what time King Gnoirangon was reigning in Kent, and he did not know that his kingdom was made over to the Pagans, and that he himself was secretly given into their power. And on this wise was the damsel given to him in marriage, and he slept with her and loved her much.

Hengist, therefore, said to the King : 'I am thy father, and I will be a counsellor unto thee, and take heed that thou overpass not my counsel ever, for thou shalt not fear to be overcome of one man nor of any people, for this people of mine is strong. I will, therefore, invite hither my son and his cousin, that is my brother's son, for that they be men of war that they may fight against the Scots, and do thou give them the lands that are in the north nigh the wall that is called Gual.' And he bade him that he should invite them, and he invited them, Ochta and Abisa with 40 chiules. But they, when they had voyaged around the Picts, wasted the Orchades Islands, and came and occupied very many regions on the further side of the Fresic sea, to wit, the sea that is between us and the Scots as far as the marshes of the Picts. And evermore Hengist invited chiules unto him little by little, so that they left the islands from whence they had come without an inhabitant. And when his people had waxed great as well in courage as in number, they came to the aforesaid Canterbury.

. In the meanwhile Guorthemir, the son of Gortigern, fought mightily against Hengist and Horsus and their people, and drove them out as far as the island that is called Taneth. They, therefore, sent messengers over sea as far as into Germany, and called out the chiules

with a mighty number of warriors and strong men. And thereafter they fought against the Kings of our people, and at our time they conquered and made broad their marches, and at another they were conquered and driven out. And Guorthemir waged war against them eagerly four times. . . . But it came to pass after the death of Guorthemir, the son of King Gortigern, and after the return of Hengist with his armed hosts, that they counselled a crafty device, to wit, that they should practice a deceit on Gortigern with his army. Wherefore they sent envoys to ask for peace, and that a lasting friendship should be made between them. And Gortigern held counsel with his elders, and they took thought what they would do, and at the last it was the counsel of all that they should make peace. And the envoys of the Saxons returned and afterwards called a meeting together, and it was resolved that on each side the Britons and Saxons should hold conference together without arms, and that peace should be firmly established between them.

Hengist, most traitorous as he was, bade each of his household set his knife under his foot along the midst of his shoe-sole, 'and when I shall cry out to you and say, 'Nimed eure saxes,' draw forth your daggers from your shoe-soles, and run in upon them and stand up against them bravely. But take heed ye slay not their king, for the sake of my daughter that I have given him in marriage, but hold him fast, for it is the better for us he should be ransomed out of our hands. And they gathered their company, and all came together to the conference in one. Howbeit, the Saxons spake friendly for all that they were acting fox-like in their heart, and they sate in fellowship man by man. And Hengist, as he had said, cried out, and all the 300 elders of King Gortigern were slain, and he alone was seized and set in chains, and yielded them very many lands for the ransom of his soul. to wit, Essex, Sussex, and Middlesex. . . ." (Nennius, Hist. XXVIII-XXXVIII.)

This is the story as told by the original authority. There is nothing in it, say later authorities, so obviously false that we need doubt its substantial accuracy. Things may

not have happened quite as they are here related, but it is only fair to assume that the record has some foundation in truth. No doubt much is to be said in favour of accepting a story of the kind when no better story can be substituted for it, and much more may be said in favour of recording an ancient national myth such as this undoubtedly is. But it may be well before accepting it either as history or myth, to make sure that it really belongs to Britain at all. Let the narrative of Nennius in reference to Hengist and Horsus be compared with the following story told by a classic author.

“In the days of King Tarquin” [i.e., Tarquinius Priscus, c. B.C. 532], “the younger men of the Phocæans set sail from Asia to the mouth of the Tiber and entered into a league of friendship with the Romans. Starting again from thence, they made their way in their ships as far as the furthest gulfs of Gaul, and founded Massilia between the Ligurians and the savage tribes of the Galli. Great things they here achieved, at one time defending themselves against the attacks of the barbarous Galli; at another, beginning the attack and harrassing those who had before been the aggressors. For the Phocæans owing to the narrow limits and the barrenness of their country, are compelled to make more diligent use of the sea than of the land, and eke out a livelihood by fishing or trading, or even by piracy on the high seas. Accordingly, after venturing to explore the furthest coasts of the ocean, they found themselves in the Gallic gulf at the mouth of the Rhone river. Here they were so taken with the pleasantness of the place that they were minded to return home to tell what they had seen, and to induce a larger number of adventurers to join them. On this second expedition, the leaders of the fleet were Simos and Protis. They held a conference accordingly with the King of the Segobrigii, Nannus by name, in whose territories they were anxious to found the city, and solicited his friendship.

It so happened that on that day the King was busy making preparations for the wedding of his daughter Gyptis, whom, according to the custom of the country, he was ready to give in marriage then and there to a son-in-law

who was to be chosen as the feast. So, as all the suitors had been bidden to the wedding, the Greek visitors were also invited to the feast. The damsel was then brought in, and her father bade her offer water to the one she would best like for her husband. Passing by all the others, she turned to the Greeks and offered the water to Protis, who was thus transformed from a guest into a son-in law, and received from his father-in-law a site whereon to found a city. Massilia was accordingly founded in a remote bay near the mouths of the river Rhone, as it were, in a corner of the sea.

From these Greeks, therefore, it was that the Galli learnt the ways of a more civilised life, and laid aside their barbaric customs in favour of others more gentle, the cultivation of their fields and the girdling their cities with walls. They began to live by law and not by arms, to prune the vine and plant the olive; and men and things were wrought to such a polish that it seemed not so much that Greece had migrated into Gaul as that Gaul had been transmuted into Greece.

After the death of Nannus, the King of the Segobrigii, from whom the site for founding the city had been received, his son, Comanus, succeeded to the kingdom. After his accession, a certain Ligurian declared that some day Massilia would be the destruction of the neighbouring tribes, and advised that it should be suppressed at the outset, lest, presently, it should wax stronger and overwhelm the kingdom. He added also this fable: Once upon a time, a bitch heavy with young, earnestly petitioned a shepherd for a place where she might bring forth her puppies. After she had obtained so much, she further petitioned to be allowed to suckle them in the same place. At last, when the puppies were full grown, she was able to rely on the assistance of her family in asserting herself to be rightful owner of the place. 'And not otherwise,' says he, 'will these Massaliotes, who already seem to be denizens of the land, hereafter be its lords.' Acting on this instigation, the King devised a plot against the Massaliotes. When the day arrived for the yearly celebration of the *Floralia*, he sent a number of stout active men

into the city under the protection of its hospitality. Others in addition he orders to be brought into the city in carts, concealed in wicker baskets, covered over with leaves. He himself with an army lies in ambush in the nearest mountains, so that when the gates should be opened at night by the men of whom I have already spoken, he might present himself opportunity for carrying out the treachery and capturing the city already overcome by sleep and wine.

These plots, however, were revealed by a certain kinswoman of the King, who was in love with one of the young Greeks. Moved to compassion by his comeliness as she lay in the youth's arms, she made known the treachery and bade him beware of the peril. He at once reported the matter to the magistrates, and the plot being thus detected, all the Ligurians were seized, and those that were in the baskets dragged from their hiding places. After all of these were killed, a crafty deceit was practised on the deceiving King, which cost him his own life and that of 7,000 of the enemy beside." (Justin, from *Trogus Pompeius XLIII. 3*, etc.)

The historian then goes on to describe the many victories won by the Massaliotes over the Gauls, the Ligurians, and the Carthaginians. The same story is told with variations by another classic writer, who, it will be seen, cites high authority for its accuracy.

"Aristotle, in his 'polity of the Massaliotes,' writes thus: The Phocæans that were in Ionia founded Massilia, in order to make use of it as an emporium. Now Euxenos the Phocæan was the guest of Nanos the king, for such was his name. This Nanos had on hand the marriage of his daughter, and as Euxenos happened to be there at the time, he invited him to the feast. Now the wedding took place on this wise. After the supper, the damsel was to come in and give a cup ready mixed to whichever one of the suitors present she would, and he to whom she should give it was to be the bridegroom. The maiden accordingly came in, and, as luck would have it, or, may be, as the fancy took her, gave it to Euxenos. The damsel's name was Petta. When the matter thus fell out,

her father, regarding the gift as a token of the will of God, accepted him as worthy to have her. Euxenos accordingly took the lady and lived with her as his wife, changing her name into Aristoxene. And to this day, the man's family is still living at Massilia called the Protidae, because a son that was born to Euxenos and Aristoxene was named Protis." [Athenaeus *Deipn.* XIII. 5, p. 576.]

Now, no reader, I think, of these three narratives can fail to be struck with their extraordinary similarity in substance, in spite of certain differences in detail. They are all, obviously and unquestionably, variants of one and the same original myth. The scene, indeed, is transferred from Gaul and Marseille to Britain and Canterbury, but the characters and the drama remain practically the same. The differences between the two classic versions, which refer with absolute certainty to the same legendary event, are in fact more widely marked than those between the version of Nennius and that of Justin, although the former locates his story at Canterbury and the latter at Marseille.

But, if this be true—and it is hard, indeed, to see how it can be denied—what becomes of the first chapter of English history as written by our "standard historians?" The original authority on which they have all relied, is not merely questioned or impugned, it is annihilated. If the first and best authority for the story of Hengist and Horsa and the Saxon invasion of the fifth century is shown, as I submit it is now shown, to be not merely mythic and legendary, but to refer to Marseille and not to Britain, no later authorities, be their names never so great and venerable, are entitled to claim credibility for any narrative based upon that of Nennius. In simple fact, the early history of England and of Canterbury alike still remains to be written. When it is written, the historian will have no difficulty in accounting for the transference of a Massaliote tradition to the shores of Kent, and hardly greater difficulty in identifying the Belgic tribes of Cæsar's day with the real fathers of the English people.

THE CATHEDRAL.

It is of course impossible in the brief space of a few pages to attempt anything like a complete description of the history of the Premier Cathedral of England, which in various ways has been connected with the main events of our national life. All members of the British Association who visit Canterbury during the Dover meeting will have facilities given them for seeing the Cathedral under competent guidance. The object of this paper is only to supply them with a few preliminary facts.

The year 1897 concluded a very memorable epoch in the History of the Church of England ; for June 2nd, 1897, was the THIRTEEN HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY of the baptism of King Ethelbert, the first Christian English king, by St. Augustine of Canterbury.

Since that day a Christian Church has always stood on the present site of Canterbury Cathedral ; and through that Cathedral and its precincts have flowed those thirteen centuries of English Christianity.

1.—In its close connexion with the great secular events of our national history, Canterbury Cathedral stands almost unrivalled. It contains the royal tombs of Henry IV. and Queen Joan of Navarre ; of Edward the Black Prince, and others of Royal lineage. It has been visited in State, and on great occasions, by nearly all our sovereigns.

In 1023 King Knut presented to the Cathedral his golden crown. On May 4th, 1130, Henry I. came here with King David of Scotland and all the English Bishops. Here on July 12th, 1174, Henry II. performed his memorable penance before the tomb of Becket. On August 23rd, 1179, the Cathedral was visited by Louis VII. of France, the first French King who ever set foot on English shores. In December 1189, Richard Cœur de Lion came here, with William, King of Scotland, and again in 1194, on his return from the Crusades. Here King John and Isabella were crowned by Archbishop Hubert Walter at Easter, 1201. Henry III. was present, as a boy,

with Archbishop Langton and Pandulph, the Papal Legate, on July 7th, 1220, at the translation of Becket's remains; and he was here re-crowned by St. Edmund in 1236. Here on September 10th, 1299, Edward I. was married to Margaret of France; and he presented the golden crown of Scotland to the Cathedral in the same year. In 1357 it was visited by the Black Prince with his prisoner, the King of France, after the battle of Poictiers; and in 1363 he built his Chantry after his marriage with the Fair Maid of Kent. Henry V. visited the Cathedral on his way home after the battle of Agincourt. In 1400 it was visited by Emmanuel, Emperor of the East: and in 1417 by Sigismund, Emperor of the West. In 1465 Edward IV. and Queen Elizabeth Woodville visited it and presented the grand north window of the Martyrdom. Henry VII. came almost every year of his reign. In 1520 Henry VIII. worshipped here in great state with the Emperor Charles V.* The late Prince Consort stopped at Canterbury, and attended the Cathedral Service, in 1840, just before his marriage with Queen Victoria. The Queen had gone over the Cathedral with the Duchess of Kent, on September 28th, 1835, previous to Her Majesty's accession, and visited Canterbury again in 1842.

2.—The Cathedral is still more closely connected with the entire stream of events in the history of our Church. Here the great Archbishop Theodore (†690) founded the first great English School, and here he placed the first Organ that was ever heard in England. All the Old English Archbishops, with only one exception, from Cuthbert (†759) to Robert (†1052), including St. Dunstan, St. Odo, and St. Alphege, lie buried under its roof; as also do the great majority of

* It has also been visited, among other sovereigns, by King Stephen; Philip, Earl of Flanders (1184); King Philip of Spain (1555); Queen Mary (1558); Queen Elizabeth (1573); Charles I. and Henrietta Maria, immediately after their marriage (1625); Charles II. (1660); William and Mary (1689); George I. (1720); George II. (1728); George Prince Regent (1798). Richard II. presented the Cathedral with £1000. Queen Mary gave some magnificent hangings.

the later Archbishops, from Lanfranc (†1089) to Cardinal Pole (†1558), including St. Anselm, St. Thomas Becket, Hubert Walter, Stephen Langton, Archbishops Peckham, Winchelsey, Bradwardine, Islip, Simon de Sudbury, Courtenay, Arundel, Chicheley, Bourchier, Morton, Warham, and other Saints and Statesmen famous in history for their high services to Church and Commonwealth.

3.—The Cathedral itself is one of the most uniquely beautiful in England. It exhibits the first traces of Early English style, and besides the ancient Roman work recognised by archæologists in the Crypt, it contains specimens of the *Præ-Norman*, Norman, Transition, Early English, Decorated, Perpendicular, and Modern styles. Its Cloisters are described by Prof. Willis as "a perfect museum of Mediæval architecture."

4.—The stateliness and beauty of Canterbury Cathedral is a matter of more than national concern. It is yearly visited by hundreds of Americans, and, with Westminster Abbey, is one of their chief points of attraction in the old Country. They, no less than we, have a profound interest in a structure so intimately connected with the history of our Church. It is also visited by multitudes from every part of our Colonial Empire, and in the summer months there are sometimes as many as a thousand visitors in a day.

It is asserted by tradition that a Christian church stood on the site of the cathedral from the very earliest days. It is said by Bede to have been built by Roman Christians ; but when the Romans abandoned England, in the decadent days of the Emperor Honorius, the building was utilised by the Saxons for pagan worship. Queen Bertha, daughter of Charibert, king of Paris, the first Christian queen of England, had stipulated on her marriage with King Ethelbert that she should be allowed to continue her Christian worship. Accordingly the little adjacent church of St. Martin's was assigned to her use, and was placed under the pastoral charge of Bishop Liudhard, who accompanied her to England. The Queen made her short cut to her little church from Ethelbert's palace through

a postern-gate in the city wall, which is still shown, and which gives its name to the famous old "Queningate Lane," between the walls of the city and the convent.

But in A.D. 597 Ethelbert was converted by St. Augustine of Canterbury. The King assigned him the old Roman temple of Canterbury as his cathedral, and, retiring to Reculver, gave up to his own palace for the residence of Augustine and his monks. The church was even then not of wood but of stone or brick, and parts of this ancient pre-Norman work, which may be nearly fifteen centuries old, are still visible in the west wall of the crypt. This Saxon cathedral was entered at the east, and had its apse at the west, and is said to have been remodelled after the design of the old basilica of St. Peter at Rome. It was dedicated to the Saviour, and known as Christ Church.

Cuthbert, the eleventh Archbishop of Canterbury, powerfully affected the fortunes of the cathedral by obtaining permission from Pope Gregory (A.D. 740) that henceforth all the archbishops might be buried within the walls of their own cathedral. Accordingly from Cuthbert (†758) to Cardinal Pole (†1559) the earthly remains of all the archbishops lie there at rest, including those of St. Odo (†958), St. Dunstan (†988), St. Alphege (†1017), St. Anselm (†1109), and St. Thomas Becket (†1170). It is a singular fact that since the Reformation no Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury has been buried in his own metropolitan cathedral, until leave was obtained for the interment of Archbishop Benson in 1895.

The popular reverence paid to cathedrals depended mainly, for many centuries, upon the estimated preciousness of the relics which they enshrined.

In 891, Archbishop Plegmund brought to the cathedral the relics of St. Blaise, to whom a chapel was dedicated. Odo (22nd archbishop) repaired the structure, added to its height, and brought to it the remains of St. Wilfrid; and about the same time four clerks brought hither the remains of St. Audoen.

In 1011 Canterbury was sacked and burned by the barbarous Danes, who took captive the saintly Archbishop

Alphege, whom they afterwards martyred at Greenwich. In 1023 King Knut had the martyr's body restored to the cathedral. In 1067 the cathedral was again consumed by a disastrous fire. In 1070 Lanfranc was consecrated archbishop, and gazed with grief on the scathed ruins of his minster. He rebuilt it during seven years and raised the number of the monks to 150. Lanfranc was succeeded by St. Anselm in 1093, and he appointed Ernulf to be prior. But Lanfranc's choir was not sufficiently magnificent for the ambition of Ernulf. "He pulled it down and re-erected it so much more splendidly," says William of Malmesbury, "that nothing like it could be seen in England for the lustre of its glass windows, the brightness of its marble pavements, and its many-coloured frescoes which attract the wondering eyes to the summits of the vaulting." As Ernulf died before the work was finished, it was continued by his successor with decorations so sumptuous that it was known henceforth as "Conrad's glorious choir." The finished church was dedicated on May 4th, 1130, by Archbishop William Corboil in a festival at which were present King Henry I., King David of Scotland, and all the bishops of England. Gervase enthusiastically remarks that "so famous a ceremony has never been heard of since the dedication of the Temple of Solomon."

But alas ! before fifty years were over, between three and four o'clock on September 5th, 1174, a fire broke out in three cottages near the monastery, and the sparks and flames were carried to the cathedral by a violent gale from the south. The fire in the cottages was easily extinguished, but the people went home without being aware of the mischief which was smouldering about the roofs of their beloved church. When the flames burst out of the roof, and melted the sheets of lead, a wild cry arose, "See ! see ! the church is on fire." The young monk Gervase was present during this thrilling scene, and furnishes us with a lively description of it. He says: "Then the people and the monks assemble in haste; they draw water, they brandish their hatchets, they run up the stairs full of eagerness, to save the church, already alas ! beyond their

help. But when they reach the roof and perceive the black smoke and scorching flames that pervade it throughout, they abandon the attempt in despair, and thinking only of their own safety, make all haste to descend.”*

The blazing beams fell crashing upon the sedilia of the monks, which caught fire in their turn, and the whole choir was soon in a blaze. The people ran to tear down and save (or some of them, alas! to steal) the pallia and curtains, while the monks were intent on rescuing the reliquaries. “In this manner the House of God, hitherto delightful as a paradise of pleasures, was now made a despicable heap of ashes, reduced to a dreary wilderness, and laid open to all the injuries of the weather.”

The paragraph which follows furnishes a most curious historic proof of the far more passionate pride in their cathedral felt by the people in those days; of the more vehement intensity and unrestrained exhibition of their emotions; and of the strange intermingling of superstition and blasphemy, which seemed to them the most natural thing in the world.

“They were astonished,” says our monkish chronicler, “that the Almighty should suffer such things, *and, maddened with excess of grief and perplexity, they tore their hair, and beat the walls and pavements of the church with their heads and hands, blaspheming the Lord and the saints, the patrons of the church: and many, both of the laity and monks, would have rather laid down their lives than that the church should so miserably have perished.* Bethink thee now what mighty grief oppresses the hearts of the sons of the Church under this great tribulation. I verily believe the afflictions of Canterbury were no less than those of Jerusalem of old, and their wailings were as the wailings of Jeremiah; *neither can mind conceive, or words express, or writing teach, their grief and anguish.*” Their patron saints “had their resting place in that wilderness, and had the monks in their deep dejection put up an altar in the

* I borrow the admirable translation of Professor Willis, whose book on “The Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral” (1845) is invaluable.

nave, they might wail and howl rather than sing the diurnal and nocturnal services."

For five years the monks remained in grief and sought various counsellors, finally agreeing to employ a skilled workman named William of Sens, "on account of his lively genius and good reputation." The Cathedral of Sens (1143-1168) has several peculiarities in common with the work of Canterbury, *e.g.*, the double piers, the foliated capitals, the square abacus, the rings upon some of the slender shafts, the system of vaulting of sexpartite ciboria so that six vaulting-cells meet in the keystone" (Willis, p. 96). For five years William laboured with admirable skill, completing five pillars on each side of the choir with the triforia and clerestory windows above them; and then he unhappily fell down fifty feet from a scaffolding, and was terribly injured. He made a brave attempt to continue the superintendence of the work from his pallet, but, finding it impossible to resist "this vengeance of God or spite of the devil," resigned his task to William the Englishman, "small in body, but in workmanship of many kinds acute and honest." He it was who continued the cathedral to Trinity Chapel and Becket's crown. In order to save the existing beautiful chapels of St. Andrew and St. Anselm, English William with great skill first contracted and then expanded the line of pillars in a way which added to the appearance of the building instead of impairing it. The whole choir and east end of the cathedral, as now it stands, and the upper portion of the exterior walls, is mainly the work of William of Sens (1175-1178), and William the Englishman (1179-1184). The style of their architecture is Transitional. Of previous work, besides the fragments of pre-Norman architecture in the crypt, we have Lanfranc's plinth and small blocks of Caen stone (1070-1077) worked into the walls in the nave and Western Transept; the foundation piers of the Central Tower in the crypt; a door in the East Cloister, and above it three windows of the old dormitory. Of Prior Ernulf's and Conrad's work (1096-1106) we have the round-arched masonry of the crypt, parts of the outer walls, of the Dark Entry (famous for the ghost of Nell Cook), and of the

monastic kitchen. Of later Norman work (1135-1145) we have sculptures on the piers and capitals of the crypt, very quaint and beautiful. The treasury furnishes the earliest specimen of diagonal ribbed vaulting. The so-called Baptistry, the Transept Towers, and the Green Court Gate, all belong to the epoch of Later Norman.

The cathedral and its buildings are "a perfect museum of mediæval architecture." From the Transitional style we pass to the First Pointed or Early English Style (1226-1236), as exhibited in the North Wall of the Cloisters and the South Alley of the Infirmary Cloister. To this period belongs the far-famed "Archbishop's Chair," usually called the "Chair of St. Augustine," on which the Archbishops of Canterbury are enthroned. It is made of three pieces of Purbeck marble, and, from the style of its decoration, is believed to have been first placed in the cathedral on July 7, 1220, at the superb ceremony of the translation of Becket's remains from the crypt to his priceless shrine. On that occasion the young King Henry III. was present, and the chest of Becket's remains was carried up the steps of Trinity Chapel by Archbishop Stephen Langton; Pandulf, the Papal legate, "of fair Milan Cardinal"; the Grand Justiciary, Hubert de Burgh; and the Archbishop of Rheims. The expenses of the patriot archbishop, to whom we owe *Magna Charta*, were so immense on this occasion—for he entertained crowds of bishops, priors, abbots, earls, barons, knights, squires, and priests—as to hamper his see for many years.

The next famous builder among the priors was Henry of Eastry (A.D. 1300), who "decorated the choir of the church with most beautiful stone-work delicately carved." This remains in excellent order. The north door of this screen is famed for its great beauty and singularity. Originally the stone-work of the whole choir was painted with rich and glowing colours—crimson and blue, with gold stars—the traces of which are still visible in places. It all resembled Archbishop Chicheley's tomb, of which the colouring is renewed at the expense of New College, which he founded. It is a singular fact that the greatest architects of all ages—Hindoo, Greek,

Roman, Mohammedan, Mediæval—recognised the glory and sanctity of colour. The Parthenon was originally a mass of crimson and blue, and like the Indian temples and the Moslem mosques glowed with mosaics and many hues. The tombs of Westminster Abbey were once a blaze of marble and lustrous enamel, and over one arch in the north transept can still be traced broad diapered bands of colouring, blue and red. Modern architects as a rule utterly neglect this element of charm and beauty, though the remains of the original colours of Henry of Eastry are still very plain behind the oak screen of the Dean's and Canon's stalls. No one, I suppose, will ever have the courage to make the choir look as richly sumptuous as it originally did. The stone-work was all covered with a most incongruous oaken Corinthian screen in 1663; the arms of Archbishop Sheldon, who became Primate in that year, are still to be seen over the Dean's stall. In early days, too, there were many frescoes of matchless interest on the walls and roofs, nearly all of which have totally disappeared, and some were ruthlessly whitewashed at the period when English taste was at its lowest ebb of decadence and commonplace. An additional element of glory was derived from the gilding of the bosses of the vaults, and from hundreds of heraldic blazonries of coats of arms, which now possess a high historic as well as archæological value.

Henry of Eastry's work belongs to the Second Pointed or Decorated style, of which one very fine specimen is the Decorated window inserted in 1330 in the South Wall of the Norman Chapel of St. Anselm.

The screen at the east end of the choir, which was of "tabernacle-work richly overlaid with gold," seems to have been destroyed by the Puritans. The present east screen is a modern imitation of work of Henry of Eastry, which is found in the screen of our Lady of the Undercroft in the crypt.

We next come to the Third Pointed, or Perpendicular style (1370-1570). The nave and transept of Lanfranc had remained untouched till 1378. In that year, seeing that it was in a ruinous condition, the great

Archbishop Simon Sudbury issued a mandate to all "ecclesiastical persons" to beg subscriptions for re-building the nave. Contributors were to be rewarded by the insertion of their names and coats of arms on the vaulting bosses ; and also—a means no longer open to us—by forty days' indulgence. The old nave was taken down at the Archbishop's expense, and as his cognisance—a talbot *sejant*—is to be seen on the west corbel of the hood of the north-west door into the nave, he probably got so far in its reconstruction. But on June 15th, 1381, he was barbarously seized and beheaded by Wat Tyier and his mob on Tower Hill. His headless remains lie in a tomb on the south side of the presbytery, with a lump of lead where the dissevered head should be. The work which he had munificently begun was continued by Prior Chillenden (A.D. 1390-1411), assisted by Archbishop Courtenay, who subscribed more than 1,000 marks ; and Archbishop Arundell, who also gave 1,000 marks, and the "Arundell ryng" of bells. The coat of arms of these two archbishops and of Archbishop Chicheley—who built (1440-1450) the Chicheley, Oxford, or Dunstan steeple—are constantly repeated in the nave and cloisters. The two north west towers were once known as the Arundell and Chicheley Towers. The great Central Tower, also called the Angel Steeple and Bell Harry Tower, was built (1495-1503) under the auspices of Archbishops Morton and Warham, and Priors Sellynge and Goldstone. The magnificent Christ Church Gateway which forms the entrance to the precincts, and is a most interesting specimen of rich and Late Perpendicular architecture, was mainly built by Prior Goldstone the Second (1517) ; and his rebus—three goldstones—is visible above the postern entrance.

Such is the external history of the fabric of the premier Cathedral of England, and it has witnessed many memorable scenes in the life of our people.

The crypt, of which I have not yet spoken, is the largest and loveliest in England. It is replete with every form of historic interest. Besides the fragments which it contains of Roman and Saxon work, much of it dates

from the days of Prior Ernulf and St. Anselm (1096-1100). The lovely chantry was built by the Black Prince in 1363 as a reward for the dispensation which allowed him to marry his cousin, the fair Maid of Kent. Her likeness is carved on one of the bosses; on others the scene of Samson slaying the Philistines with the jawbone of an ass, and the British lion with his tongue protruded, are supposed to be allusions to his great victory at Poictiers. The original Norman vault of this chantry has been replaced by a *lierne* vault—i.e., with a vault on which liernes or transverse ribs are mixed with the ribs which branch from the vaulting capitals (Willis, p. 115). In St. Gabriel's Chapel the ancient and deeply interesting mural paintings of the twelfth century are still in admirable preservation. Here are the tombs of Lady Mohun, and of Archbishop Morton (1500), marked by his rebus of a hawk (mort) and a ton. It was here that the remains of Becket lay from 1170 to 1220, and here that Henry II., fasting and discrowned, with naked feet, bared back, and streaming tears, performed on July 12th, 1174, the memorable penance for his share in the murder of Becket. With his head partly thrust into one of the openings through which the actual coffin was visible, he knelt and received five strokes from every bishop and abbot who was present, and three strokes from each of the eighty monks. As they beat him he urged them to strike harder, so as to make the penance very real, and each of them as the stroke descended, said: “Even as Christ was scourged for the sin of men, so be thou scourged for thine own sins.”

The remains discovered near the site of Becket's tomb in January, 1888, are, in my opinion, beyond all doubt, the remains of Becket himself; but it would require an entire paper to set forth the argument, and to tell the story of their discovery and recognition with all the inferences which it involves.

Since the days of Queen Elizabeth the crypt has been assigned to a congregation of refugee Walloons and Huguenots, driven out of the Netherlands by the brutal and bloody persecutions of Alva (1567), and out of France

just after the massacre of St. Bartholomew (August 24th, 1572), and then after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685). One of the houses in the precincts, known as *Meist Omers*, was assigned by the Tudor Queen to Odo, Cardinal of Chatillon, brother of the great Admiral Coligny, who was driven out of France because of his Huguenot proclivities. In this house he died in 1571, murdered, according to tradition, by his valet with a poisoned pear. The singular meanness of the great Cardinal's tomb in Trinity Chapel is accounted for by the surmise that it was only meant to be his temporary resting-place, till his mortal remains could be removed and laid with those of his famous ancestors. But this honour has never been paid him.

The cloisters are exquisitely beautiful and full of historic reminiscences. They contain some eight hundred, now nearly obliterated, coats of arms—once gorgeous with their proper blazonry—of princely and noble contributors in the early part of the fifteenth century. These cloisters, originally Norman, were restored in Archbishop Langton's time (about 1236), in the Early English style. They were finally rebuilt in their present Perpendicular style by Prior Chillenden about 1400. Those who wish to recall the scene they presented in the memorable winter twilight of December 29th, 1170, just before Becket's murder, must read the thrilling story in Dean Stanley's *Memorials of Canterbury*. The archbishop entered them by the north-west door, through the cellarer's lodgings, hurried along the north walk, turned with wavering and uncertain steps into the chapter-house in the east walk, and finally entered the cathedral by the door—which shows three separate styles of architecture—opening on the part of the cathedral now called “the Martyrdom,” from the scene of his murder. The four armed knights who were in pursuit of him entered the cloisters by the south-west door from the precincts of the archbishop's palace. To the veneration felt for the “holy blissful martyr,” and the belief in the mighty miracles wrought by his relics, the cathedral owed five centuries of prosperity and enrichment from the gifts poured into Becket's shrine by hundreds of thousands of pilgrims.

I have thus briefly touched on the main outlines of the history of the material structure ; it would take many pages to describe the famous events which have occurred under these ancient roofs, and to reproduce these scenes the visitor must exercise his own imagination.

The following Summary will perhaps be found useful :—

CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL. FROM THE WORKS OF EDMER THE SINGER, AND OTHERS.

A.D.

602.—*St. Augustine* (the first Archbishop) recovered a church which he was told had been constructed by Roman believers. This church he consecrated as “Christ Church,” where he established a habitation for himself, and for all his successors.

740 to 758.—*Cuthbert* (the eleventh Archbishop) built a church to the east of the great church, and almost touching it, which he dedicated to St. John the Baptist. He built this for baptisms, judicial trials, and as a burial place for the archbishops, instead of, as till then, beyond the walls of the city ; and he was accordingly buried in the church of St. John.

940 to 960.—*St. Odo* (the twenty-second Archbishop) finding the roof of Christ Church decayed through age, removed it ; heightened the walls, and built a new roof.

1011.—In the primacy of *St. Elphege* (the twenty-eighth Archbishop) the sack of Canterbury by the Danes took place. Barrels were piled against the church and lighted. The lead of the roof melted and ran down inside, driving out the monks, who were then, all but four, slaughtered. The Archbishop was led away, imprisoned for seven months, and killed. His body was ransomed by the Londoners and buried in St. Paul’s. The roof was not burnt, though the ornaments of the church were plundered.

1023.—*King Canute* ordered the body of *St. Elphege* to be restored from St. Paul's, and assisted *Archbishop Egelnorth* to restore the cathedral to its former dignity.

1067.—The city was accidentally set on fire, and the conflagration destroyed Christ Church, the church of St. John the Baptist, and nearly all the monastic offices.

1070.—*Archbishop Lanfranc* (the first Archbishop after the Norman Conquest), pulled down the remains of the cathedral and monastic buildings, and began the re-construction of the whole.

1077.—*Lanfranc's* church completed.

1093.—His successor, *Archbishop St. Amselm* appointed *Ernulf* to be Prior, who began taking down *Lanfranc's* choir and rebuilding it much more magnificently.

1107.—He left his work unfinished in 1107, when he became Abbot of Peterborough.

1107 to 1130.—*Conrad*, who succeeded *Ernulf* as Prior, continued the latter's work on a scale of even greater magnificence under Archbishops *Radulph* and *William Corboil*, who dedicated it with great splendour on the 4th of May, 1130.

1170.—*Archbishop St. Thomas à Becket* was murdered in the North Transept on Tuesday, the 29th of December, 1170.

1174.—Memorable penance of Henry II in the crypt.

1174.—On the 5th of September, 1174, between three and four p.m., during an extraordinarily violent south wind, a fire broke out before the gate of the church and outside the walls of the monastery, by which three cottages were half destroyed. While the fire was being subdued, sparks had been driven by the high wind between the joints of the lead covering of the roof of the church, and had ignited its timbering without being perceived, owing to the leaden covering above and the well-painted ceiling below. Everybody therefore went home, and later on, when the flames began to shew themselves, a cry arose, "See ! see ! the church is on fire."

1175-1178.—The rebuilding of the cathedral was magnificently carried out by William of Sens, until he was disabled by a fall of fifty feet from a scaffolding.

1179.—Visit of Louis VII of France.

1179-1184.—The Work of William of Sens was ably continued by William the Englishman, who introduced more of the Early English style of Architecture.

1189.—Visit of King Richard I and William of Scotland

1201.—Coronation in the Cathedral of King John and Queen Isabella.

1220.—Removal of Archbishop Becket's remains from his tomb in the crypt to the gorgeous shrine in Trinity Chapel, by Archbishop Stephen Langton.

1236.—Henry III re crowned by Archbishop St. Edmund Rich.

1279.—Marriage of Edward I and Margaret of France.

1300.—Choir Screen erected, in the Decorated Style, by Prior Henry of Eastry.

1357.—Visit of Black Prince with the captive King John of France.

1374-1396.—The Cloisters rebuilt by Archbishops Arundel and Courtenay.

1378.—Rebuilding of the Nave, in the Perpendicular Style, begun by Archbishop London, of Sudbury.

1400.—The Chapter House completed by Prior Chillenden.

1413.—Visit of King Henry V.

1500.—The Great Bell Harry Tower, built by Archbishop Morton and Prior Goldstone.

1561-1571.—Walloons and Huguenots permitted to use the Crypt.

1572.—Visit of Queen Elizabeth.

1642.—The Cathedral terribly damaged by the Puritans.

1835.—Visit of the Princess Victoria.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S ABBEY.

The ruins of the Abbey of St. Augustine at Canterbury have a special interest for Englishmen, inasmuch as they mark the site of the first church built for Augustine and his companions after their favourable reception by Ethelbert, King of the West Saxons, in 597.

The earliest church on the site was that of St. Pancras, the remains of which still exist, partly within the grounds of the Kent and Canterbury Hospital, partly on the adjoining land, in the eastern part of the old monastic precinct. The story that it was once the idol temple where Ethelbert was wont to worship before he became a Christian, and a modern theory that the building belongs to the Roman period, may alike be dismissed as improbable. The church was, undoubtedly, built of Roman materials, but its plan clearly belongs to the earliest Saxon type, and we have evidence of its having been hallowed and used by Austin himself.

Both the church and the adjoining land were given to Augustine, by Ethelbert, who, in 598, began another and larger church in honour of the Apostles Peter and Paul, as a place of burial (it being outside the city) for himself and his successors. In it, too, Augustine appointed that he and his successors should be buried. In 605 the place was ready for the establishment of a monastery of the Order of St. Benedict, but the church was neither finished nor hallowed when Augustine died the same year, and he was laid to rest in a temporary grave at its door. In 613 the church was hallowed by Archbishop Laurence, and the body of Augustine translated to his appointed burial place in the north porch or transept. Here were also buried the five archbishops who succeeded Augustine, but the "porch" then being full, Theodore (668-690) and the next three archbishops were interred elsewhere in the church. Cuthbert (741-758) and his successors, excepting Janbert (763-790), who was buried in the church of St. Peter and St. Paul, received sepulture, by dispensation from Pope Gregory, in their Cathedral Church of Christ. King Ethelbert died

in 616, and was buried within the church of St. Peter and St. Paul, which he had founded, in the porch or transept of St. Martin, where Queen Bertha and Liuthard had already been laid to rest. Ethelbert's successor, his son Edbald, was a man of evil life and a pagan, but in 618 he became a Christian, and in expiation of his former sins began another church to the east of the monastery, in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Between it and the monastery lay the monk's cemetery. There were, therefore, three Saxon churches on this spot, that of St Pancras, Ethelbert's Abbey Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, and the Church of Our Lady founded by Edbald. A reconstruction or enlargement of the abbey church must have taken place some time before 978, for in that year it was hallowed anew by Archbishop Dunstan in honour of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Augustine. Further works of reconstruction were in progress in the following century, and in 1047 Archbishop Eadsin gave 100 marks towards a tower then in building. In 1055 or 1058 Wlfric, the 40th Abbot, was minded to enlarge the church. He accordingly pulled down the east end of it, and also destroyed the west end of Edbald's church of Our Lady. He then appropriated the ground between the two buildings, having purged the cemetery which lay there, but died in 1059, before anything could be done to connect the two churches. The work remained in this state until the time of Abbot Scotland (1070-1087), who, after some hesitation, began on the site of Edbald's church a new presbytery with the crypt of Our Lady beneath, and the shrine of St. Augustine above. Abbot Wydo completed the new work, and in 1091 translated into it St. Augustine's body from the north transept, wherein it had lain for five centuries.

This third church is that of which the ruins have come down to us. It appears to have consisted of a presbytery or eastern arm of three bays, with an apse and an encircling aisle, out of which opened three circular chapels, probably all built over a crypt, as at Christchurch, a central tower, north and south transepts, probably each with an eastern apse; and a nave and aisles of ten or eleven bays with two western towers. The quire occupied the crossing and easternmost bays of the nave, and in the north aisle, as at

Christchurch, was a chapel of Our Lady, recorded to occupy the site of the north transept of Ethelbert's church, and the burial place of Augustine and his near successors. Sundry minor alterations were made in the church between the 12th century and the Suppression in 1538, but so far as is known, these did not affect the plan, which seems to have remained unaltered to the end. A portion of the north aisle wall, and the base of the north-western or "Ethelbert's" tower alone remain to attest the former magnificence of this famous church, the site of which is now occupied in part by a field and in part by the Hospital gardens.

The cloister and monastic buildings, as at Christchurch, were on the north side of the church. The eastern range, containing the chapter house and the monks' dormitory or dorter, was rebuilt by Abbot Flory (1021-1124), but a new chapter-house was built between 1325 and 1333. The monks' dining hall or frater, which formed the northern range, was begun to be rebuilt in 1260, and finished six years later. Some remains of it, and of the lavatory (made 1272) in the cloister beside its entrance exist in the garden north of the ruins of the church. The kitchen was rebuilt 1287-91. The western range, as at Westminster, and originally at Gloucester, perhaps formed the abbot's lodging, which was largely re-constructed during the closing years of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth century. To the east of the buildings was the infirmary, and to the west lay the outer or base court, containing guesthouses and other accommodation for pilgrims and visitors of different grades. The existing great gate of the monastery, which opened into it, was rebuilt *temp.* Abbot Thomas of Finedon (1283-1309.) On the south of the church, as at Christchurch, was the layfolk's cemetery, which had a separate gatehouse facing Burgate, built before 1391. The monks' cemetery adjoined it on the east, and between them was the charnel chapel dedicated in 1298. On the south side of the precinct stood the campanile or bell tower, on the lofty mound still visible within the grounds of the Hospital.

The abbey was surrendered by the abbot and thirty monks on July 30, Henry VIII. (1538). So much of the church and other buildings as was deemed "superfluous" was pulled down, but the rest was retained in the King's hands and converted into a palace for his reception. This seems to have been formed out of the abbot's lodgings on the west side of the cloister, and though all the palace itself has gone, some traces of it may be seen in the brick buttresses and windows in what is left of the church wall, which owes its preservation to its forming one side of the palace. By 1655, if we may judge by old views, the church and claustral buildings had been reduced almost to their present fragmentary condition. The buildings in the outer court adjoining the great gate had been converted into a house, and was for some time the residence of the Wottons. But the whole site gradually became more and more degraded, and Hasted in his *History of Kent*, published 1799, says (iv. 662): "So little is the veneration paid at this time to the remains of this *once sacred habitation*, that the principal apartments adjoining the gateway, are converted into *an ale-house*; the gateway itself into a *brew-house*, the steam of which has defaced the beautiful paintings over it; the great courtyard is turned into *a bowling green*; the chapel and aisle of the church on the *north* side into *a fives-court*; and the great room over the gate into a *cock-pit*." Much the same state of things existed down to 1845, when the property happened to come to the landowner, and was bought by the late Mr. A. J. B. Beresford Hope, M.P., who gave it for the site of a Missionary College for the behoof of the Colonial Church. The new College of St. Augustine was incorporated by Royal Charter on 28th June, 1848, and the remaining buildings having been meanwhile prepared for use, the chapel was consecrated on the following day. The old guesten hall, which stands over an undercroft, has been converted into a dining hall for the students, with the kitchen beneath. Upon the ruined undercroft of the abbot's hall has been raised the library, and other new buildings added for the accommodation of the students. On entering by the great gate, it will be seen that the

college occupies the old outer court of the monastery. A kitchen garden is laid out within the area of the cloister, and extends northward over the sites of the frater and kitchen. The site of the nave of the abbey church and of the lay folks' cemetery are now within the grounds of the Hospital. The remains of the transepts and eastern area of the church of the eastern range of buildings, and of the infirmary, lie buried in the field east of the College.

It is a thousand pities that a site, fraught with so many historical associations and bound up so intimately with the early history of the English Church, should be dismembered as it is, instead of being once more and as a whole under the control of the Church of England.

ST. PANCRAS.

The ruins of St. Pancras, in the grounds of the Kent and Canterbury Hospital, are at first sight somewhat confusing, because the Roman or Saxon foundations are mixed up with, and intersected by, the walls of the Mediæval Church and modern masonry. The original building consisted of a short wide nave and a large round-ended presbytery separated from the nave by an arcade of three arches. There are also visible a porch to the west, and one to the south, with some indications of a porch to the north. The walls are built of Roman bricks, one foot ten inches thick, and there are manifest traces of a floor of opus signum. The western porch is ten feet six inches long and nine feet three inches wide, with an opening in the west end of the width of six feet six inches. At a depth of 15 inches below the pavement were discovered tombs covered with large chamfered slabs of Portland oolite. On the east side of this porch, leading into the nave, is a doorway of Norman workmanship, two feet eight inches wide. In the southern porch are the remains of an altar, four feet four inches by two feet two inches, which is probably built on the same foundations as the altar mentioned by Thorn, a monk of St. Augustine's monastery, who says that "when Augustine was celebrating mass at the altar erected on the spot where formerly stood the idol of King Ethelbert, the devil, seeing himself driven out from the nave which he had inherited for long ages, tried to overturn the Church from its foundations, and that the marks of this were still apparent on the exterior eastern wall of the above-mentioned porch." These so-called "devil's marks" are shown on an engraving bearing the date 1784, but have since disappeared. There are some traces of a staircase leading down into this porch, and it is not impossible that it may have been once used as a Baptistry.

We may notice a massive circular Roman pillar at the S.E. corner of the nave, and at its base was found a portion of a Roman phial.

The tradition reproduced by Thorn at the end of the 14th century is that there was, midway between the Church of St. Martin and the walls of the city, the temple or idol house of King Ethelbert, which temple Augustine purged from the pollutions and filth of the Gentiles, and changed it into a church, which he dedicated to the martyr, St. Pancras, who was a Roman boy of noble family, martyred under Diocletian, and whose name would have been well known to Augustine, of the St. Andrew's Monastery on the Cœlian Hill, from which Augustine came, was built on the very property which had belonged to the family of St. Pancras.

The date of these ruins is still a matter of controversy. That some Roman building stood once upon the spot is tolerably certain from various indications, but we cannot positively say that the ground floor of the existing foundations is Roman. Mr. Micklethwaite considers that St. Pancras is one of a group of small churches without aisles, built under the Italian influence in Saxon times, though he does not deny that it was used by Augustine himself, and therefore must date at any rate from the end of the sixth century. It is much to be regretted that the complete ground plan of the original church cannot be laid bare, as a portion of it stands in an adjoining property, and cannot at present be explored. The standing arch at the east end, though built to a large extent of Roman bricks, is a portion of the Mediæval Church.

ST. MARTIN'S CHURCH.

The interest attached to St. Martin's Church arises both from its associations and its structure. The date of the existing building is a source of never-ending controversy, as it contains many features attributable either to Roman or Saxon architecture, while, whatever may be thought of its possible connection with Christian soldiers of the Roman army or with St. Martin of Tours, there can be no doubt that it was the oratory of Queen Bertha and her chaplain, Bishop Liudhard, as well as the scene of St. Augustine's preaching and the baptism of Ethelbert, King of Kent. Within the walls of this cradle of English Christianity, Divine Service has been celebrated for at least 13 centuries without any apparent interruption.

In a short sketch of this kind it would be at once irrelevant and impossible to enter into controversial details, or to attempt to reconcile the positive assertions of many modern antiquaries with the well-founded traditions of history—antiquaries are not of necessity historians, nor are historians of necessity antiquaries. We must supplement or balance the researches and explorations of the one by the written records of the other.

The Venerable Bede, writing within 100 years after the death of St. Augustine, states that there was (in 597) in Canterbury, a church "dedicated to the honour of St. Martin, and built of old while the Romans still occupied Britain." This is strong testimony, especially when we remember that Bede derived his information with regard to the history of Christianity in Kent from Albinus, Abbot of St. Augustine's, who was himself a pupil of Archbishop Theodore; and we are told that Albinus referred to the records in his keeping, and sent Nothelm, a priest of London, to search the papal archives at Rome. After the departure of the Romans from Britain (in about 409) it is not improbable that the church was still used by a small band of Christian worshippers till (at any rate) the landing of the heathen Jutes in the Isle of Thanet in 449. But the curtain of Christian history on this island is not again lifted

till the mission of St. Augustine in the year 597. He and his companions are expressly said to have performed all religious functions in St. Martin's Church, which had been restored a few years previously for the use of Queen Bertha ; and the first fruits of their mission soon appeared in the conversion and Baptism of King Ethelbert. Subsequently to the death of St. Augustine, Ethelbert, and Bertha, St. Martin relapses into a state of comparative obscurity, but it is alluded to in a Saxon charter of 867, attested by Ethelred, " King of the West Saxons and Kentishmen,"—possibly suffered some injury at the hands of the Danes in 1011, and gave its name to at least two suffragan "Bishops of St. Martin's" shortly before the Norman Conquest. The church was partially restored by the Normans, as well as at the beginning of the 13th century, and in the 14th century there was attached to it a grammar school, probably one of the earliest grammar schools in England. The fact of the Church being exempt from the jurisdiction of the Archdeacons of Canterbury deprives us of much information, which, in the case of other parishes, is contained in the Archidiaconal Registers. We find, however, some entries concerning it in Archbishop Warham's Visitation of 1511 ; and an inventory of the "ornaments of the church" in 1552. From the latter date down to the present time it has had little, or no, history. The general aspect of the structure from outside, though suggestive of antiquity, is lacking in uniformity of treatment. The walls have been patched and repaired in successive ages, and are cemented together with hard " seashore " mortar, composed of pebbles, small shells, etc. The brick courses in the nave are at irregular intervals, varying from 9 to 20 inches apart, filled up between with roughly-hewn Kentish ragstone and occasional blocks of chalk, five or six courses of stone intervening in some portions of the wall between the courses of brick. The masonry of the early chancel, extending 18 or 20 feet east of the chancel arch, is composed of Roman bricks, laid evenly upon one another with narrow joints, averaging four bricks to a foot. This chancel was lengthened at the beginning of the 13th century, a still further addition being made at a subsequent

date, so that the chancel as it now appears may be assigned to at least three distinct periods. Outside the Church may be seen five flat pilaster buttresses and one semi-circular one (all of uncertain date), a square-headed Roman doorway at the S.W. of the chancel, with a Saxon doorway 4 feet east of it, two early English porches on the N. and S.W. of the nave, and a doorway in a curious position at the S.E. corner of the nave, concerning the use and origin of which there has been much controversy, though it is undoubtedly a later insertion in the adjoining wall. We may notice also a nearly circular panel on the S. side of the nave, incorrectly represented as a door in old prints of the church, and a Norman hagioscope at the W. end of the nave.

The ground floor of the church has been altered more than once. If, as is thought by many antiquaries, the chancel is the earliest portion of the building, the original church must have been much smaller than the present one, consisting (perhaps) of a chancel 10 feet long, terminating in an eastern apse, and separated from a nave of about equal length by a cross wall carrying a single chancel arch. It is disputed whether the present nave was added about the end of the Roman occupation of Britain, or built during the mission of St. Augustine. The west wall is specially noticeable for an arch or opening above the existing doorway, flanked on either side by two splayed windows built *more Romano*, having their jambs of chalk blocks filled in with white mortar, while the arches were turned in Roman bricks and rough voussoirs of Kentish rag-stone with interstices of pink mortar, the variation of the mortar from white to pink being exactly paralleled in the Roman Pharos at Dover. Near these windows, and at various parts of the nave behind the woodwork, are portions of pink plaster still adhering to the wall, similar in colour and texture to that found in many Roman villas. The best known feature of interest in the church is the Font, which is tub-shaped, consisting of a rim, three tiers, and a base. The lower tier is embellished with a continuous pattern of scroll-work, the second tier with groups of circles intertwining one another, the third tier with intersecting

arches. The composition of the font is most unusual, instead of being, as might have been expected, scooped out of a single block of Caen stone, it is made up of 22 separate stones. The character of the carving points to a late Norman period : but it is not improbable that the Font dates from Saxon times, and was afterwards decorated in a somewhat rough manner, to do honour to an historical monument. We need only allude briefly (1) to the door in the North wall of the nave with jambs of Caen stones of irregular size, and having to the east of it an ancient stoup for Holy Water ; (2) to the Norman piscina, of much gracefulness and beauty ; (3) to the door or window, opening from the west wall into the tower, which is of the Decorated period, and connected with a tower-chamber, used either as a sleeping-room or study by the priest, or by watchers who guarded the shrines and relics of the Church ; (4) to the sedile in the chancel, built of Roman bricks from the demolished eastern apse ; (5) the so-called "leper's window" behind the reading desk ; (6) to the tomb of the restorer of the Church in the 13th century, which used to be shown as the tomb of Queen Bertha ; (7) the linen-pattern aumbry, dating from the time of Henry VII. ; and (8) to the two Elizabethan brasses. The cumbrous monument inside the altar rails is interesting historically as being the monument of Sir John Finch (afterwards Baron Fordwich) who was Speaker of the House of Commons in the reign of Charles I., and was held down in his chair by Hobbes and others, in order that the protest might be passed against the infraction of the Petition of Right.

There are no very old engravings of St. Martin's Church, and the aspect of the building in pre-Reformation times can only be gathered from bequests and allusions in the wills of parishioners. There was a wood-beam (the holes for the ends of which may still be seen) ; the *high altar*, dedicated to St. Martin ; an altar on N.E. of the nave, dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and another on the S.E. of the nave to St. Nicholas ; also images of St. Christopher and St. Erasmus.

One of the most interesting relics of Mediæval times preserved in the Church is the Chrismatory, dating from the 14th century. It is a brass box containing three pewter pots. The necessity of keeping the three oils [(1) the Holy Chrism, (2) the oil for anointing the sick, (3) the oil for catechumens] in distinct compartments is insisted upon by Archbishop Alfric, "Ye ought to have three flasks ready for the three oils, for we dare not put them together in one oil vessel, because each of them is hallowed apart for a particular service."

Whatever may finally be determined to be the date of the Church's foundation, it can never lose its unique association with St. Augustine, Ethelbert, and Bertha, nor its undisputed claim to be the oldest existing Church in England. From it flowed the tiny spring of English Christianity which has since widened out into a mighty river, and penetrated the remotest parts of the civilized and uncivilized world.

OTHER CHURCHES.

Of the other churches in Canterbury, though nearly all are interesting and many are famous, only the briefest notice is possible in the present handbook.

ST. ALPHEGE

Situated in Palace Street, and dedicated to the Archbishop martyred by the Danes in 1011, was rebuilt about the middle of the fifteenth century. It contains many notable monuments and epitaphs.

ST. ANDREW'S.

"The old church being situate in the middle of the High Street of the city, and the passage thereof being rendered thereby incommodious and unsafe," was pulled

down in 1763, the present substitute being built some distance back. It contains a monument to Thomas Swift, Rector in 1592, great grandfather of the far more celebrated Jonathan Swift.

HOLY CROSS, WESTGATE.

Originally over the west gate itself, this church was moved to its present site by Archbishop Sudbury in 1480. The perpendicular tracery in some of the windows is fairly perfect, and in spite of early Victorian restoration, this church still retains much of its ancient character. It contains some good wood carving. In the tower is a peal of five bells, one of which, cast in the latter half of the fourteenth century, bears the inscription in Lombardic capitals, "Stephanus Nortone me fecit."

ST. DUNSTAN'S

Founded by Archbishop Lanfranc towards the end of the eleventh century, was formerly one of the most important of the Canterbury churches. It has an unusual semi-circular tower adjoining the square Western tower on the Southern side, and contains some notable monuments of the Roper family. In the Roper vault is still preserved the head of Sir Thomas More, whose daughter Margaret married one of the Ropers. Hither to St. Dunstan's in 1174 came Henry II., King of England, on his famed pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury. Having entered the church and partly stripped, he donned the hair shirt and cloak of a pilgrim, and walked barefoot to the cathedral. The wealth of the Canterbury churches in pre-Reformation days may be gathered from an inventory still existing of the treasures belonging to St. Dunstan's in 1500. These include angels of ivory and of burnished gold, chalices and other vessels of silver, precious stones and vestments, books, banners, bells, and other ecclesiastical garniture of enormous value.

ST. GEORGE'S.

In the continuation of High Street, though containing a few monuments of interest, has lost its ancient character.

ST. GREGORY'S.

A modern church, built by Sir Gilbert Scott in 1852. It stands near the site of the Norman church founded by Archbishop Lanfranc.

ST. MARGARET'S.

In the street of the same name, renovated, mutilated, and partially rebuilt. This church, with the exception of a monument to Sir George Newman, erected in 1627, contains little of general interest.

ST. MARY BREDIN.

Erected in 1867, on the site of an old Norman church. It contains several monuments of the Hales and Chiche families of the Donjon Manor.

ST. MARY BREDMAN.

So-called from the bread market formerly held close by. A modern church on the site of an older one. This church, now pronounced unsafe, is shortly to be demolished, a fate, perhaps, not undeserved.

ST. MARY MAGDALENE.

In Burgate Street. The body of this church was taken down some years ago when the Norman font and its 16th century brasses disappeared. Only the square tower built in 1503 now remains. The Rev. R. H. Barham, the author of the Ingoldsby Legends, was born in this parish.

ST. MARY NORTHGATE.

All but the north side of the old Norman church was pulled down at the time the more modern church was built. In its early days this church formed the northern gate of the city; and here the Mayor and Corporation used to receive the King on his journeys to and from the Isle of Thanet, and present him with the keys of the City.

ST. MILDRED'S.

Situated in Stone Street near the city walls. This church is certainly one of the most ancient in Canterbury. Not only do Roman tiles abound in the walls, but the massive blocks of oolite, built into the quoins of the south wall of the nave, were probably taken from a Roman building. Stow mentions that this church was burnt in the year 1246, but how much of it was then destroyed is not recorded. The tower was demolished in 1832, and the materials and bells sold. In 1626 Izaak Walton was wedded here to Rachel Floud.

ST. PAUL'S.

In Church Street, without the walls, built in the 13th century and restored in recent times. This church contains the monument of Sir William Rooke. His son, Admiral Sir George Rooke, the hero of Gibraltar, is buried here.

ST. PETER'S.

This interesting little church, at the corner of St. Peter's Lane, contains a few traces of 13th century work, and in the small square tower may be seen fragments of Roman tiles and wrought stone, similar to those found in St. Mildred's.

ALL SAINTS.

The existing church, now closed, built on the site of an older one, has never been celebrated except for its bad taste and monumental ugliness.

ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY.

In Burgate Street is a modern church with a rich interior. It was opened in 1875 by Cardinal Manning. Of other once-celebrated churches in the city now existing only in name, St. Edmund Ridings, St. John's, St. Mary de Castro, St. Mary of Queen'sgate, and St. Michael of Burgate, not one stone remains above another.

FRIARIES, ETC.

THE BLACK FRIARS

first reached Canterbury in 1221, and were established in the Parish of St. Alphege on the banks of the river a little below St. Peter's Church in 1236. This was the first house of the Dominicans in England. The entrance to the friary and the church have almost disappeared, but a picturesque view of the ruins may be obtained from Mount's Nursery (Entrance in St. Peter's Street). The ancient refectory, with its windows high up in the walls, still stands, and is now used as a chapel. The friary was disestablished at the Reformation, and subsequently passed into the hands of the Anabaptists, who used the Refectory as a place of worship. Daniel Defoe is said to have frequently preached here.

THE GREY FRIARS,

or Franciscans, had a house assigned to them on the banks of the river on the south side of St. Peter's Street almost immediately after their first arrival in England in the early years of the 13th century. The small remains of the old Minorite establishment are hidden from view by the houses in St. Peter's Street and Stour Street, but parts of the old boundary walls remain, as does an old building resting on pointed arches over the river. This, in far later days, became the home of the Lovelaces, and belonged to the grandfather of the unfortunate Cavalier-Poet, Richard Lovelace.

THE WHITE FRIARS.

In addition to the Dominicans and Franciscans, the Agustinians, or White Friars, were also settled in Canterbury in the Parish of St. George's, as early as 1325. All traces of their house and church have, however, unfortunately disappeared. The site of the friary is now occupied by the Simon Langton Schools, so called since they have been endowed with the estate of the Poor Priests' Hospital, founded by Simon Langton, the brother of Stephen, in the 13th century.

THE KNIGHTS TEMPLAR.

One of the principal Preceptories of the Knight's Templar in England formerly stood near the North Gate under the City walls. When the Order was suppressed in 1308, and the following years, Canterbury became the scene of some of the most hideous secret and public atrocities perpetrated by the feeble Edward II, at the instigation of the Holy Inquisition and the French Pope, Clement V. No vestige of the house remains at the present day..

THE PRIORY OF ST. GREGORY,

an establishment mentioned in Domesday, and considered to be the first house of regular canons in the Kingdom, was founded by Archbishop Lanfranc. It was converted into a Priory in the reign of Henry I, and was burnt in the year 1145. At the beginning of this century, when a part of the Priory and the belfry was still standing, a pottery and tobacco pipe manufactory was established among the ruins, all traces of which have now disappeared. The precincts were for many years used as market gardens.

ST. SEPULCRE'S NUNNERY,

Founded by St. Anselm, about the year 1100, for a Prioress and five nuns, occupied a site to the south of St. Augustine's, and was dissolved at the Reformation. The few ruins left standing at the beginning of the century were used to build the walls of some houses erected on the site. Elizabeth Barton, The Holy Maid of Kent, was a sister in this Nunnery.

MEDIÆVAL HISTORY.

KING ETHELBERT.

The mediæval history of Canterbury begins with the mission of S. Augustine by S. Gregory. At that time Ethelbert, whose long reign lasted from 568 to 616, was King of Kent. "This Ethelbert," says Bede, "was the son of Irminric, the son of Octa, the son of Oeric surnamed Oisc, from whom the Kings of Kent are called Oiscings. Oisc was the son of Hengist, who, being invited by Vortigern, first came into Britain with his son Oisc, as I have said above." This last paragraph, as we have seen, may safely be dismissed as unhistoric, but the former part of the pedigree may possibly have some foundation in truth. As in all early genealogies, the immediate ancestry is in all probability accurately traced, but in the earlier generations a great number of names are omitted, only those names being recorded which were still preserved by tradition as those of monarchs from whom the reigning dynasty either were descended or wished it to be believed that they were descended. It is merely a surmise, but I believe that it is possible to identify the Oeric or Oisc, or as other chroniclers spell the word, *Æsc*, with some approach to probability if not to certainty. I have elsewhere mentioned Commius who was made King of Arras by Cæsar, and subsequently appears to have been king of a considerable portion of south-east Britain, including Kent. Commius seems to have left three sons, Tincommius, Eppillus, and Verica, among whom, as is proved by the coins they struck, his dominions were divided. The coins struck by Verica on this side the Channel have been mostly found in Sussex, but other coins apparently bearing his name have been found in the north of France, which seem to indicate that he not only succeeded to part of his father's kingdom in Britain, but also to the sovereignty held by his father over the Atrebates or people of Arras on the Continent as well. If this conjecture

originated by my brother in the Supplement to his work on British coins be correct, Verica must have been a monarch of very considerable importance and distinction, whom a King of Kent even six centuries later might well be proud to number among his ancestors.

It would be rash to assume that the Oeric who figures in Ethelbert's genealogy is identical with the King Verica whose coins are found on both sides of the Channel, but the similarity of name is at least remarkable, and the long interval of Roman domination in Britain may well account for the disappearance of the intermediate stages of descent. The first independent King of Kent after that secular subjection of his forefathers might well wish to revive the remembrance of the independence of his country before the Roman invasion became a reality. The surname of Oisc or $\text{\ae}sc$, which gave a patronymic to the Kings of Kent, seems to me to be equally significant in another direction. A vast proportion of the names to be found in our early chronicles are simply those of places transformed into persons. Thus Cissanceaster or Chichester supplied the chroniclers with a king Cissa, Natanleod, or Netley, near Southampton with a prince Natanleod, Ebbsfleet, close by Sandwich, with a Wipped and so on. Now, I cannot avoid a strong suspicion that Ash-next-Sandwich is the locality which here appears personified as Oisc or $\text{\ae}sc$, one of the mythic kings of Kent. At Guiton, close by, was a cemetery where the remains which have been found bear witness to the high rank of those that were interred there, and other cemeteries in the immediate neighbourhood, show how densely populated was the district during the "Early Saxon" period. The local tradition referred to by Mr. Planché, of a golden idol still believed to have been buried there points in the same direction. There is also a singular reference in the chronicles to the existence of a "King's Hall," an *aula regia* at Eastry, in the seventh century, which shows a continued connection between the $\text{\ae}scings$ and this particular district of the former kingdom, a connection which may well have dated from the days of the real Verica.

HENGIST AND HORSA.

Nor, perhaps, is the fact that Oeric is represented as the son of Hengist without significance. The earliest British coinage, struck in imitation of the gold *stater* of Philip II of Macedon, shows on its reverse, like the original from which it was copied, a two-horse chariot with its driver. As the design gradually degenerated in the hands of copyist after copyist, the chariot and driver became more and more indistinguishable. Two horses alone were all that caught the eye upon the coin. A little later only one horse was visible, and finally it was hard to make out even the figure of a horse in the strange dots and lines that made up the unintelligible jumble stamped by the Belgic moneyer on his coins. The existence, however, of the coinage itself is a monument of the immigration of the people among whom the coinage was current. On every piece of the money they used, both invaders and invaded had continually under their eyes a symbol and token of the invasion. Is it merely fanciful to believe that the two horses, the most conspicuous features of the earlier coinage were regarded as having effected the conquest of the land? The metaphor is natural enough. Hengist and Horsa, the "horse and mare" figured upon the coins, had in simple fact won the sovereignty of south-eastern Britain, and this true metaphor of Belgic domination may well have originated the mythic names given to the first conquerors in later ages. The "White Horse of Kent" also may well have had the same origin, and the "White Horses" cut in the turf of Berkshire and Wiltshire hill sides, were in all probability originally landmarks designed to show how far to the west the frontiers of England had advanced against the British Celt at the time they were first defiantly designed upon the greensward of the downs.

THE BRETWALDA.

Returning to the narrative of Bede, it is to be observed that S. Gregory, in addressing Ethelbert, styles him not King of Kent, but "King of the English." This, I take it, is due to the fact that Ethelbert in addition to being King

of Kent, was also the third of the “Angul-Saxon” monarchs who held the title of “Bretwalda,” or sovereign of all the English kingdoms south of the Humber. This title has been the subject of much controversy. That in some way it is a survival of the Roman system of government in Britain seems to be partially admitted even by those who uphold the theory of a cataclysmal Saxon invasion in the fifth century, and, indeed, the word itself, which is merely a translation of the Roman *Dux Britanniae* seems to be conclusive on this point. The Roman *Comes Britanniae* seems in the *Notitia Imperii* in which these officials are mentioned to be the higher in rank of the two, but “Bretwalda” is a nearer translation of the *Dux*, and the functions of the Roman *dux* or “duke” were probably more nearly allied to those exercised in Saxon times by the Bretwalda. After the transfer of the Roman empire from Rome to Byzantium, Britain, like the other provinces, was ruled from Constantinople. The distance of our island from the seat of government naturally threw a greater power into the hands of the provincial officials, while the Roman garrisons were depleted by the continually increasing demand for soldiers required for other services. A time finally arrived when the great majority of Roman legionaries were withdrawn from Britain, but it must be remembered that Constantinople never formally recognised the independence of Britain, and there can be no doubt that Byzantine officialdom regarded the island as part of the Roman Empire long after anything like efficient occupation by the Roman garrison had ceased.

CANTERBURY AND CONSTANTINOPLE.

S. Gregory, as may be seen in the pages of Bede, dates his letters to Ethelred and others by the year of the reign of the great and unhappy Emperor Maurice. It is probable that even at this time both Ethelred, “King of the English,” and Ethelred’s father-in-law, Charibert, “King of the Franks” at Paris would still acknowledge themselves, independent kings as they were in reality, the nominal

vassals of the same Emperor. But if this be so, the Bretwaldaship ceases to be an enigma. It is, in fact, the office of the old *Dux Britanniaæ* conferred by the Emperor at Constantinople on one or other of the independent kings of Britain, who was thereby invested with certain temporary sovereign rights over his fellow-kings. The Bretwalda for the time being was, in fact, the representative of the Byzantine Emperor in Britain. Without a military force in the country, it was impossible for the Emperor to appoint an officer of his own to a post of the kind, but obviously it would be to the interest of a powerful British prince to pay highly for a title and an office which could not but increase his prestige and power, and equally obviously it was to the interest of the Emperor to retain the right and custom of conferring the dignity long after he had ceased to exercise any real power in this island, both as a record of former claims not yet definitely abandoned, and as a source of revenue. However shadowy the claims might have become, it was well worth while on both sides to maintain it. In this view, it is easy to understand why Byzantine policy should systematically refuse to confer the office of Bretwaldaship on the same native dynasty twice in succession. The policy of the empire was to prevent the union of all Britain under one ruler and to profit by its internal dissensions. It was not likely to allow the office of Bretwalda to descend from father to son, and thus permanently strengthen one dynasty at the expense of all the others. This, as I read our early history, is the reason why after the King of Sussex had held the office he was succeeded by a King of Wessex, and the King of Wessex by Ethelbert of Kent, Kent in turn resigning it to East Anglia, and East Anglia to Northumbria. To the maintenance of this connexion between Constantinople and Britain may probably also be attributed the distinctively Byzantine style assumed by so many of the Anglo-Saxon Kings in their charters, although Ethelbert himself seems to have been content with the simple title "King of the English."

EARLY ENGLISH CHRISTIANITY.

The late Mr. Freeman and others have pointed out that there must have been more Christians among the English population at the time of the advent of St. Augustine than is compatible with the utter heathendom generally ascribed to them. The Church of S. Martin, Bede tells us, was "built while the Romans were still in the island," and he goes on to say that when the King was converted to the faith, he allowed the missionaries "to build or repair churches in all places," which at least implies that there were not a few Christian churches in Ethelbert's dominions, however sorely they may have needed repair. The fact appears to be that such Christianity as did exist among the English was mainly of the same Roman type as that which was preached by Augustine and his fellow missionaries with whom the English Christians would be only too glad to fraternize. Their adherence to the new preachers was simply a matter of course, and would attract but little attention in comparison with the wide and, indeed, insurmountable differences existing between the Christianity preached by Augustine, and that inculcated by the leaders of the Celtic churches in Britain. It has lately been suggested by Mr. F. C. Conybeare that the early Christianity of Britain was of an "Adoptionist" type—the Christianity, if such it can be called, of Paul of Samosata, from whom it derived the name of "Paulician." If this surmise be correct—and it is countenanced by many passages in Bede, as well as by the conduct of S. Augustine in his dealings with the Welsh Christians—it certainly affords a simple and satisfactory explanation of the bitter hostility which obviously existed between the Latin and Welsh churches. It further vindicates the character of S. Augustine from the charges of intolerance and want of Christian charity which have been brought against him, and palliates, if it does not justify, the exultation of Bede over the slaughter of the monks of Bangor Iscoed. The doctrine, indeed, that Christ was not Christ until he was made so by baptism lay then, as now, beyond the pale of toleration by Roman or general Christianity. It had even been proscribed by the empire before the empire

became Christian. Twice condemned by a Council of the Church, Paul had retained the bishopric of Antioch under Zenobia, Empress of Palmyra, until her capture and the defeat of her armies by Aurelian in 272. The Church of Antioch then appealed to Aurelian to confirm their decision. Aurelian referred the matter to the Bishops of Italy, who held that Antioch should conform to the doctrine of Rome. The first dogmatic triumph of Roman Christianity thus owed its validity to the decree of a still pagan emperor. From this date, therefore, at the latest, any Christian teaching which found its way into Britain from a Roman source would be of a distinctively Roman type, and as such, fundamentally opposed to that of the Welsh portion of the population. It was on the marches of Wales that Augustine met the representatives of Welsh Christianity. The journey from Canterbury must have been difficult as well as long, and even the Bretwaldaship of Ethelbert, under whose protection the missionaries travelled, would have been insufficient to ensure their safety had their journey lain through a purely heathen population absolutely hostile to a new creed. The whole narrative, indeed, reads as if the Roman soldiers of Christ had marched through a perfectly friendly country until they encountered their first real enemies in the Nonconformist Christians of the Celtic border. Feeble and dispirited, unorganised or disorganised, such Christianity as may have existed among the English may have been, it is hard to believe that it was entirely non-existent, although no distinct record exists of its re-animation and organisation by Augustine and his companions. There is some evidence, indeed, that the earliest English as well as Celtic Christianity was "Adoptionist." Had baptism been a new thing in England in the days of Augustine, there can be little doubt that the Romanised Greek word would have been adopted by the earliest converts. The first English documents, however, always translate what was afterwards called "baptism" by the word *fulluht*, which means "perfection." This was also the name by which the sacrament was known among the followers of Paul of Samosata, and in later days became a "note" of the heresy of those who employed it.

THE MINT.

The fact that no coins of Eppillus, the son of Commius, have been discovered beyond the limits of Kent, seems to point to the existence of a Mint at Canterbury in the earliest years of the Christian era. It is probable, indeed, that the very earliest of British coins were struck here, and that the first Canterbury Mint may have been at work some two centuries before Christ. After the Claudian conquest of Britain, however, the Roman coinage rapidly displaced the native British, and continued to be practically the only currency in Britain for the next four hundred years. Some of the innumerable coins found in Britain bearing the image and superscription of the Roman Cæsars were probably struck in the island, but there is no direct evidence of the issue of any money from a British Mint during the Roman occupation. That many of the coins called *sceattas*, which form the link between the Roman and the Saxon coinage, and show the influence of the continued connection between Britain and Constantinople, were struck in Canterbury is almost certain, but the absence of any inscription upon them prevents their identification.

A unique gold *triens*, dating from about the year 600, in the Bibliothèque National at Paris, bears the inscription DOROVERNIS CIVITAS, with the name of Eusebius as that of the moneyer. There is no cross upon it, and it is supposed to have been struck by Ethelbert, at Canterbury, before his conversion. The evidence is scanty, but the Frankish character of the coin itself, and the fact that Ethelbert's wife was a Frankish princess, seem to show that at this time Frankish influence was predominant at the court and capital of Ethelbert. No coin now known bears the name of any Monarch of the *Æscing* dynasty, and this is the only one that bears the name of Canterbury until after the kingdom of Kent had passed into the hands of Offa of Mercia.

It was in the days of Offa that the silver "penny" superseded the *sceatta* as the national currency, and the inscriptions on the coins first began to give definite information as to the moneyer who minted it, the place where it originated, and the authority under which it was issued.

The first Canterbury pennies form two distinct series, those issued by the kings and those issued by the archbishops. Both commence nearly at the same time, the earliest of the royal issue being those of an Egbert, unknown to the chroniclers, but who seems by his charters to have reigned in Kent from 765 to about 791, and the earliest of the archiepiscopal issue being those of Jaenbert, archbishop from 766 to 790. Both Jaenbert and his successor $\text{\textlangle}ethelheard}$ inscribed the name of Offa on their coins without the name of any moneyer, the coins of $\text{\textlangle}ethelheard}$ struck after 796 bearing the name of Coenwulf, Offa's successor on the throne of Mercia. The Egbert, therefore, who appears as king of Kent at this time, was clearly a vassal of the kings of Mercia.

Offa seems to have felt that the existence of the Archbispòric at Canterbury conferred a somewhat undue pre-eminence on the kingdom of Kent, and after the synod of Cealchythe (Chelsea), Lichfield was erected into an archbispòric. The Midland primacy, however, did not survive its first Archbishop, who died in 802. Some of the coins of $\text{\textlangle}ethelheard}$ gave him the title of *PONT* (*Pontifex*, or Bishop), and are supposed to have been struck during the interval between his election in 791 and his consecration in 793. It is possible, however, that Offa contemplated a complete transference of the primacy from Canterbury to Lichfield, and the reduction of Canterbury to a suffragan see. If this were the case, he would probably insist on $\text{\textlangle}ethelheard}$ employing the humbler title.

The four succeeding Archbishops, Wulfred, Ceolnoth, $\text{\textlangle}ethelred}$, and Plegmund, also all struck pennies of their own, but the name of any king, whether of Kent or Mercia, is absent, and the name of the city, or more frequently that of the moneyer, is substituted. Plegmund, the last of the six Archbishops whose heads appear on their coins, had been "Bishop of Wiltshire," whatever that title may imply. He was invited to the court of King Alfred, consecrated Archbishop in 890, and died in 914. "A learned and venerable man, who faithfully and gloriously governed the Church," he is entitled to the grateful remembrance of all Englishmen as one of the compilers of the Anglo-Saxon

Chronicle. The Archbishops continued to strike coins at Canterbury till the sixteenth century, when the Archiepiscopal coinage came to an end with the second issue of King Henry VIII. The distinction between it and the royal coinage was indicated only by a special mark or letter.

In the royal series of Canterbury, the unknown Egbert is followed by Eadberht II, generally distinguished by the surname Pren, Præn, or Prænn. This unintelligible surname, absent from all his coins and unexplained by any chronicler, represents, I believe, nothing more than the blunder of a medieval scribe. Some chronicler, as I surmise, finding the name of Eadberht mentioned a second time in the list of Kentish Kings, and wrongly inferring that the same person was intended in both cases, added to the second entry the abbreviation “*pren*,” or “*præn*,” to signify *prænominatus*, or, in English, “*aforesaid*.” A subsequent scribe, finding the note “*præn*,” mistook it for a surname, and thus distinguished the second Eadberht by tacking on to his name the blunder of the earlier scribe. However this may be, Eadberht II obtained the throne of Kent in 796, was captured and blinded by Coenwulf of Mercia in 798, and finally released at Winchelcombe with the consent of Cuthred, whom Coenwulf raised to the throne of Kent. After Cuthred's death, Baldred became king, presumably still as vassal to Mercia. Baldred was driven across the Thames by the army of Egbert of Wessex in 825, and thenceforward the Mint at Canterbury was no longer the Mint of the Kings of Kent, whether sovereigns or vassals, but one of the many Mints of the Kings of England, the last coins that issued from it being the silver ones of Edward VI in the sixteenth century.

THE LAWS OF KENT.

One direction in which the influence of Constantinople made itself felt in Britain is that of jurisprudence. The mighty work then lately achieved by Justinian in the codification of the Roman law seems to have inspired Ethelbert with the idea of reducing into a written form the laws of Kent. Those laws originally, it may be assumed,

of the type common to all the Belgic folk, had been profoundly modified by the Roman law imposed and enforced by the Roman conqueror during many centuries. In fact, long before the final departure of the Roman legions from Britain, the main features of Kentish law were, as they continued to be, of a Roman type, although the influence of its Belgic origin was still far from being obliterated. When Kent, however, at length recovered its independence, a new influence came into play. The Germanic races who had made themselves masters of the Western Empire introduced a new system and new institutions into the domain formerly subject to Roman law alone, and while the conquered population in the provinces were permitted, and, indeed, encouraged to retain the *Lex Romana*, the conquerors themselves insisted on being governed only in accordance with their own Germanic laws and institutions. The system of personal and class laws thus introduced naturally gave rise to continual difficulties, many of them absolutely insoluble except upon the broad but unsatisfactory principle that might is right. These difficulties soon became so urgent that the two great branches of the Gothic race, the East and the West Goths, almost simultaneously, about the year 500, found it necessary to codify their laws in such a manner as to make them applicable alike to the conquerors and the conquered by incorporating into the Germanic system all that great portion of the Roman law which were not directly in conflict with their own. The West Goths in Spain and Gaul adopted the code known as the *Breviary of Alaric II*, the East Goths in Italy that of *Theodoric the Great*. Some thirty years later, 528-533, the Emperor *Justinian* achieved the great task of codifying the laws of the Eastern Empire. In both East and West examples had thus been set of systematizing the law, and *Ethelbert*, to the lasting honour of himself and his kingdom of Kent, was the first English prince to recognize the political and social importance of following the example. What strikes the reader as the most salient feature in the laws of *Ethelbert* is the singular and apparently arbitrary system of appraising penal offences, including murder, at a fixed tariff of money fines. This,

indeed, is a characteristic of all or nearly all the many codes adopted by the Belgic and Teutonic peoples approximately contemporary with this of Ethelbert's. The singular prominence of the characteristic is, however, deceptive. In any system of class and personal legislation, it was of primary importance to institute a fixed assessment of fines for common criminal offences. It was the inequality not the amount of the fine inflicted that constituted a dangerous popular grievance, and in fixing a uniform standard, the ruler of the people, if he did not establish the equality of all classes, established at least the equality of all members of the class to which the offender belonged, in the eyes of the law. But to suppose that the laws of Ethelbert represent the whole, or even any large part of the laws in force in Kent at the time is a mistake. They represent only the Statute law of the time. The common law, the *lex non scripta*, then as now, was the real basis of the jurisprudence. That common law was in fact the Roman law already in force for centuries, modified by the influences to which I have referred. The only real novelty in Ethelbert's code is the provision contained in the first clause for regulating the legal status of the new Christian priesthood. At a considerably later period, 673-685, Hlothere and Eadric introduced several changes in the criminal and civil laws of Kent, and a little later still, about the beginning of the 8th century, Wihtraed found it necessary to add a number of provisions in reference to matters ecclesiastical. The laws of Ine of Wessex, it may be observed, were issued nearly a century, and those of Offa of Mercia more than a century and a half later than those of Ethelbert of Kent.

GAVELKIND.

"Gavelkind" is a "word of fear" to the Kentish legal practitioner who has learnt to distrust the general impression that all land in Kent which has not been "disgavelled" has always been and still is "gavelkind." From a very early date, the lands under cultivation in Kent were broadly divisible into allodial lands, those held by the king, nobles

and "landed gentry," and socage lands, held by the farmers and husbandmen. Broadly speaking, it was only the latter which was originally gavelkind. The land of the Earl from the first descended to the eldest son ; the land of the churl was portioned among his children. The *allodium*, or in later phrase, the demesne of the lord of the laud was inherited on a principle inapplicable to the *socage* or *gavelkind* of the tenant, which, roughly speaking, covered an extent about twice that of the allodial land.

The following extracts from the "Custumal of Kent," drawn up in 1293, may serve to show some of the principal peculiarities of Gavelkind tenure as understood at the time. The "Custumal" begins with a declaration gratifying to all men of Kent :—" All the bodies of Kentishmen are as free as the other free bodies of England." In other words, although there might be men in a servile condition in other parts of England, every Kentishman was a freeman. The gavelkind tenure of the churl might not be as the allodial tenure of the earl, but it was a free tenure. The "Gavelkind men" . . . "may give and sell their lands and tenements without licence asked of their lords, saving to their lords the rents and services due from the same holdings. And all and each of them by writ of the king or by plaint may plead for obtaining their right of their lords as well as of other persons." . . . "If any tenant in gavelkind be attainted of felony whereby he suffereth judgment of death, let the king have all his chattels, and let his heir forthwith after his death be herited of all his lands and tenements that he holds in gavelkind in fee and in inheritance, and he shall hold them by the same services and customs as his ancestors held them ; whereof it is said in Kentish :—

"The fader to the bougue,
And the son to the plogh."

.. "If any tenant in gavelkind die and be herited of lands and tenements of gavelkind, that all his sons partake that heritage in equal portions. And if none heir male there be, let the partition be made among the females, even as between brothers. And in like manner let the messuage be departed between them, but let the hearth-

place remain to the youngest son or daughter, and let the value thereof be delivered to each of the parceners in that heritage to forty feet from that hearth-place if the tenement may allow thereof. And then let the eldest brother have the first choice and the others after, according to degree. In like manner of houses that shall be found in such messuages, let them be departed among the heirs in equal portions, that is to say, by the foot if need be, save only the covert" (or, perhaps, *court*) "of the hearth-place that remains to the youngest son or daughter as aforesaid, but so nevertheless that the youngest make reasonable amends to his parceners for the part that belongeth unto them by the award of good men."

... "In like manner let the chattels of gavelkinders be departed into three parts after the funeral and the debts be paid, if there be lawful issue living, in such sort that death have one part and the lawful sons and daughters the other part, and the wife the third part, and if there be no lawful issue living, let death have one half and the living wife the other half."

... "And hereby let it be known that from such time as these gavelkind heirs be or have passed the age of fifteen years, it is allowed to them to give and sell their lands and tenements at their will, saving the services to the chief lords as aforesaid." . . .

"These be the usages of gavelkind and of gavelkinders in Kent, that were before the Conquest and at the Conquest and at all times until now."

"Death" (*la mort*) in the paragraph relating to the disposal of the estate of a gavelkinder defunct, is equivalent to "the deceased," and the meaning of the passage is that the gavelkind tenant had a right to dispose by will of one-third of his holding.

The fact that gavelkind, the immemorial socage tenure, in Kent, is a survival from Saxon into Norman and modern days is universally admitted, but the fact, equally certain, that it is a survival of Roman law into Saxon times is almost as universally ignored. Its existence to-day is perhaps one of the most striking demonstrations that can be adduced of the real continuity of English history during the fifth and

sixth centuries, which the professed champions of the continuity of history have so strenuously endeavoured to deny.

Until 1234, that part of Canterbury which was within the royal demesne, was governed by the two kings' bailiffs, the successors of the *duumviri* who had ruled the city under the Roman system. In that year, however, Henry III granted the city to the citizens in fee-farm at an annual fixed rent of sixty pounds, and thenceforward the tenure in the former royal demesne was "free burgage." Up to that time, the six aldermanries of the city had been held at freeholds of inheritance by sergeantcy of the crown. When the tenure became burgage, they were held by the "commonalty of Canterbury," until they were bought up by the city. It is clear, however, that a great part of Canterbury was never held by gavelkind or any other socage tenure. Domesday Book tells how Ranulf de Columbels holds thirty-three acres of arable, which the burgesses held in their guild of the king, and fourscore acres which the burgesses hold of the king in *allodium*. Sonner also quotes a charter granting a parcel of land without the walls between Queningate and Burgate, to the monks of Christ Church, in which the grantor says, "And I will that the monks hold that land altogether free, as I and my ancestors have done, and answer for it to no lord." In the 12th century also the hereditary Alderman of Ridingate Ward grants two messuages to St. Laurence's Hospital, "which are situated in that book-land for which I answer to no lord." In these cases, and others might be cited, the land was obviously not held by gavelkind. One privilege of the citizens and their wives in Canterbury, London, and a few other boroughs was the right by custom of devising their freeholds within the liberties of the city.

THE MAYOR AND COMMONALTY.

The *duumviri* already referred to were annually appointed by the imperial authority, presumably by the Count of the Saxon shore, and although in later days, Saxon and Norman, they were appointed by the king, and were called bailiffs, their succession in all probability remained unbroken.

The first great change in their status was made in 1234, when Henry III granted the city in fee-farm to the citizens. The charter by which this privilege is granted also confers on the citizens the right of electing their own bailiffs "among themselves." This resignation of the royal right to appoint the bailiffs into the hands of the citizens really represents a longer step towards free self-government than the substitution of a mayor in the place of the two bailiffs by Henry VI in 1448. The franchises of Canterbury had long been far in advance of those enjoyed by most English cities. In 1194, Henry II had granted the citizens the right of not being compelled to plead without the walls of the city, and freedom from tolls throughout all England, besides a number of other valuable privileges, in addition to "all other liberties and customs that they had in the time of King Henry, my grandfather (Henry I), and whosoever they had them more freely and better."

Four years after the election of the first mayor in 1448, John Lynde, who had been one of the bailiffs the year before, the Mayor was empowered to appoint a "bailiff," who in fact was the sheriff, a reduction was made in the amount of the rent of the fee-farm of the city, and the city was made a county by itself. Henry VII, in 1497, introduced an important alteration in the constitution of the "commonalty" by reducing the number of common council men to 24 instead of 36 as formerly, and on the other hand increasing the number of aldermen from 6 to 12. He further fixed the salary of the Mayor at twenty pounds annually, "and no more." The first Recorder of Canterbury, Sir John Boys, was appointed under a charter granted by James I in 1609. A fair in "Le Dane John Field" on March 1 was granted by Charles II in 1684. The charter, however, granting the fair and other privileges, has a sinister history of its own. In 1682, Charles had issued a proclamation declaring his intention of resuming all chartered immunities throughout the kingdom. The citizens of Canterbury declined to surrender their charter, and were accordingly served with a writ of *Quo warranto* to compel them to do so. A meeting was held December 13, 1683, to consider what return was to be made to the writ,

and in January, 1684, the House of Burghmote announced that they were neither willing nor able to contest the writ. On April 11, accordingly, the surrender of the franchises and liberties of the city "to the use of the King's majesty" was duly sealed, and in August the charter of James I was actually surrendered. In November the charter referred to was granted by Charles, but among the provisions it contains for securing that the city "from henceforth for ever may be and remain a city of peace and quietness," are certain clauses displacing several of the aldermen and common-councilmen and substituting others, and appointing Sir William Rooke to be Mayor.

Charles died on February 6, 1685, but the troubles of Canterbury were far from being at an end. In the first place, there was a little bill of £306 9s. 6d. to be paid for the expenses of the *Quo warranto*, and when James II had time to attend to Canterbury, in January, 1687, he seized the charter granted by his brother and remodelled it, bundled out Mr. Henry Lee, who had been duly elected Mayor, and appointed Mr. John Kingsford to succeed him, taking care to supply him with a substantial majority by ejecting several obnoxious aldermen and replacing them by others more obsequious. Kingsford was again appointed Mayor the next year, but the news that William of Orange had set sail for England disturbed His Majesty's arrangements. At the latter end of October he revoked Charles's charter and restored that of James I. On December 11 he abdicated the throne of England, and the commonalty elected Mr. Henry Gibbs as Mayor for the remainder of the term.

With the election of the first Mayor in 1448, the two Bailiffs, High and Low, ceased to exist. A fairly complete list of these officials from 1215, the year of the Magna Charta, onwards is still preserved, but before that date the records of any city officials are extremely scanty. There is, however, occasional mention of another officer, whose functions in early days were more important even than those of the Bailiffs. This is the Portreeve, who appears as late as 1199, some years after the election of the Bailiffs had been transferred into the hands of the citizens. The name of

the Portreeve in that year is Winulphus Dives, or Rich, possibly the father of St. Willian Rich, who became Archbishop in 1234. In all probability, too, Alfward, who is mentioned as *Prepositus Regis* in 1011, when Canterbury was sacked and St. Alphege martyred by the Danes, was the King's Portreeve rather than one of the King's Bailiffs of the city. In 956, Hlothewig is recorded as Portreeve, and as early as 780, one Aldhune signs his name to a charter as *Præfector civitatis*, which is probably only the old Roman name of the same office. In the later days of the Roman Empire a municipal officer was appointed in the cities and boroughs, whose principal function was the assessment and collection of taxes, fines, and other imposts, for which he had to account to the treasury. He also had charge of the gaol, and was generally responsible in matters of police. He was remunerated for his services by being allowed to keep the "third penny," or one-third of the sum he collected as taxes. The office, the functions, and the method of payment remained practically unchanged from Roman into Saxon and Norman times. The only difference was that the Romans generally called him *principalis*, or, as at Canterbury, *Præfector civitatis*, while the "Angul-Saxons" called him the Portreeve, and the later English the "Sheriff."

PILGRIMAGES.

The shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury possessed at one time a greater attraction for pilgrims than any other in Christendom. For years it eclipsed even that of St. James of Compostella in Galicia, the apostle "baron" who, on his milk-white charger, overthrew the Moors of Spain. Other English "hallows," such as Our Lady of Walsingham, enjoyed their day of popularity and fashion, but none of them had so strong and abiding an interest for the pilgrim. Canterbury lay on the high road between the capital and the Continent, and a powerful political sentiment was enlisted in favour of the murdered Archbishop in addition to the many other motives which influenced the choice of the mediæval Palmer. The pilgrim of the later middle ages, indeed, may be regarded as the lineal ancestor of the tourist, tripper, and excursionist of to-day. The

treasures of the religious houses, their vestments and appointments, their jewellery and their holy relics, were the museums and picture galleries he went to see. A knuckle-bone of St. Mary Magdalene was to him as interesting as the Venus of Milo to his descendant, and the Three Kings of Cologne as the marbles of the Parthenon. The religious motive for going on the pilgrimage was certainly more general, perhaps more powerful, than to-day, but after all it was not the prevailing motive of the majority of pilgrims. The "Canterbury Pilgrimage" of Chaucer and his continuator resembles nothing in modern life so closely as a travelling party personally conducted by a Cook or a Gaze.

In the case of St. Thomas of Canterbury the political element of attraction was for many years kept well to the front by the events of at least two generations following the martyrdom. The Archbishop was murdered on December 29th, 1170. He was the champion of the Church against the King, and the cause of the Church was regarded as the cause of the people. When Stephen Langton was consecrated Archbishop by Innocent III. in 1207, the secular feud between Church and King, which had smouldered on through the intervening years again blazed out with redoubled fury. The cause of Langton and the crusaders who wrung the Great Charter from John was naturally identified with that of Becket against Henry II, and not a few, both of clerics and layfolk, undertook a pilgrimage to the shrine of the dead champion in order to testify their sympathy with the living one.

Langton is often styled the "patriot Archbishop," and the part he played in obtaining the Great Charter entitles him to the epithet. But it should not be forgotten that he was also mainly instrumental in the eminently unpatriotic attempt to set Lewis, the son of the French King Philip "Augustus" on the throne of England, and that in continuing the Crusade against John, after John had submitted to Pandulf, he was acting as treacherously towards the Pope who consecrated him as towards the King against whom he was in rebellion in order to supplant him by a foreign prince.

It was this political aspect of the martyrdom of St. Thomas, insisted on for political reasons by Langton, that first invested the martyr's tomb with its special and peculiar interest. It was the rallying point of the adherents of the Church as distinguished from the friends of the King. In later days both the religious and the political motives for undertaking the pilgrimage gradually dwindled into a sentiment, itself a sufficient motive to induce many to join in what was practically a pleasure party in the days of Geoffry Chaucer.

THE RIVER STOUR

Rises at Kingsworth, near Ashford, and flows by Wye and Chartham to Canterbury, where it divides into two streams. One of these, formerly called the King's River, runs through the city under the King's Bridge, while the other continues its course outside the walls by the Westgate till it again joins the King's River at Abbot's Hill. Thence the river flows on to Fordwich, the ancient port of Canterbury, and so on to Sandwich, where it reaches the sea some two miles from the old Haven. As late as the beginning of the 17th century the Stour was navigable as far as Fordwich for vessels of 12 tons, and the prosperity and decay of this interesting old suburb of Canterbury may be exactly measured by the condition of the Stour and Wantsum, which formerly separated Thanet from the East of Kent. As the estuary silted up and the broad river became a narrow one, so flowed away the sea from Fordwich and the profits from the Canterbury trade. Gradually this ancient limb of the Cinque Ports sank, as Stonor had sunk a little earlier, into a petty town, of which there now exist but the scantiest remnants. The Stour, though no longer navigable, is still famed for the size and flavour of its trout. In the 16th century the Corporation owned the swans on the river, and kept a swanherd to tend them. There was formerly a "cucking stool," used to punish scolding and brawling women at the Abbot's Hill, and another similar stool is still preserved at Fordwich.

THE CITY WALLS.

That Canterbury must have afforded some means of protection to its earliest inhabitants is indisputable, and the finding of the remains of stakes and wattles several feet below the level of the old city ditch, points to the fact that even in the earliest times Canterbury must have been, as its Celtic name implies, a "stronghold in the marsh." In Roman times there is no doubt that the city was surrounded by an earthen wall and ditch, and though no Roman work has been traced in recent times, except where Roman bricks have been found embedded in the existing wall, it is recorded by Bunce that in his time there still stood in the Castle yard "a most perfect Roman arch built altogether of Roman bricks, and supposed to be the old Worthgate." This arch was removed about 1791. That the walls were still standing in the time of Ethelbert is more than probable, and that Canterbury was a walled city at the time of the Danish invasion in 1011 may be gathered from the account of the seige given by Richard of Howden, who tells us that "the Danes cast the English people from the walls." How far these early walls were left standing is uncertain, but they must have been very thoroughly restored or rebuilt by the Normans, for as early as 1142 it was the boast of the citizens of Canterbury that their walls were "whole and undecayed." Until well into the last century there was probably no city in England which could show its walls in a more perfect state than Canterbury, and in Somner's time there were upwards of 21 watching towers and six gates still standing. To-day, partly owing to the fact that the Corporation of the period was short of building materials, only six or seven turrets and one gate, Westgate, remain.

THE CITY GATES.

Westgate, at the entrance of the great London Road, said to have been the largest and best built of any gate in the City, was erected by Archbishop Sudbury. It is embattled, portcullised, and machicolated, and till the

middle of the present century was used as the City prison. A few instruments of torture, fetters, and other relics are still to be seen in the rooms of the towers, and a great number of the City records are stored in the curious wooden strong rooms built at one end of the great Chamber over the Gateway. Westgate owes its preservation to one of the Mayors of the City, who used his casting vote against a petition from Mr. W. Wombwell, the owner of the celebrated travelling menagerie, to have the Gate removed to allow more room for his procession. The best idea of the traces of the other old City Gates is to be obtained by starting from the entrance to the Dane John Gardens, near the East station, and walking upon the city walls past the Dane John itself, over the Watling Street at Riding Gate, then on past the sites of St. George's Gate and Burgate, to Queningate, opposite St. Augustine's, and so on to Northgate, and by St. Radigund's Lane to Westgate. The sites of the Roman Worthgate and Wincheap Gate will hardly repay a visit.

STABLEGATE.

Close to the Northgate was the site of the Black Prince's Chantry in the Parish of St. Alphege is the ancient district, still known as Stablegate, given by King Ethelbert to St. Augustine and his monks when they first arrived in Canterbury, bearing before them their silver cross, and singing, "We beseech Thee, O Lord, in all Thy mercy, that Thy wrath and Thine anger may be removed from this City and from thy Holy House, Allelujah!" St. Radigund's bath, with its natural spring of "sweet" water, supposed from remains found there, to have been a Roman bath, is also near the Northgate, outside the walls.

THE CASTLE.

Canterbury Castle, mentioned in Domesday as having been received by the King in exchange from the Archbishop and Abbot of St. Augustine's, was undoubtedly in existence long before the Conquest. The fortifications were considerably increased by Henry II, and as a fortress guarding the main roads from the coast to London, it played an important part with the Castle at Dover in the protection of the Country. Its walls enclosed an area of about five acres, and a prison was kept within them as early as the reign of Edward II, it being for a considerable period the principal gaol in the County. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, the entire Castle fell into disuse and neglect, and at the present day nothing remains of the once famous castle which counted Hubert de Burgh amongst its Governors, except the massive walls of the Keep. This, the third largest Norman Keep in England, much resembles the smaller Keeps of Rochester and Dover. The lower floors were provided only with loopholes, being kept for store rooms and guard-chambers, while the second floor, with its great arched windows, contained the state rooms and the principal entrance. The walls, more than eleven feet in thickness, enclose an area of about 88 feet by 80 feet. Unhappily, Canterbury Castle, one of the most interesting historic monuments of the country, is still, at the close of the nineteenth century, allowed to remain in the hands of the local Gas Company, who have turned it into a coal-bunk. May we without offence suggest to the citizens and wealthy neighbours of Canterbury, the Corporation of the City, and the Society for the Preservation of Ancient Monuments, that this is not quite as it should be in the Mother City of England?

THE DANE JOHN.

Known at different times as Danzil, Dauzon, Daungron, Dungeon, and Dane John, and not infrequently, though wrongly associated with the Danish Invasion, in all probability dates back to pre-historic times. That the

mound at some period of its existence was used for the defence of the City in conjunction with the two other mounds, one apparently larger and one smaller, which were formerly to be seen in the Martyr's Field now partially covered by the present Railway Station, seems equally probable. The only fact about the earliest history of the Dane John which seems certain is, that it was in existence before the City walls were planned, as they curve outwards in order to enclose it within their circuit. The mound was made into its present shape at the end of the last century, by cutting away a part of its base and carrying it to the top, a process which added 17 feet to its height. During the repair of the City walls near the Dane John in 1883, some bones, flint implements, and sling stones, as well as some Roman pottery and ornaments, were discovered, while some fragments of Roman mosaic pavement were found embedded in the walls. The Gardens of the Dane John which seem to have belonged to the Citizens from time immemorial, were one time used for the practice of archery. They were laid out for the benefit of the public in 1790, and are much frequented in the summer months. The view of the City and surrounding country from the top of the mound, though somewhat marred by the ridiculous pillar erected in 1803, amply repays the trouble of getting there. Close by, in former days, stood the ancient Dane John Mansion now destroyed to make room for the East Railway Station. It belonged at one time to the Chiche family, one of whom was Bailiff of the City in 1259 and again in 1271. It subsequently passed to the Brents, Butlers, and Hales. It is on record that a certain William Pennington, to whom the Manor had been leased in the 15th century, cut a deep dyke between the mound and the Ridingate to prevent the ingress of the citizens to their favourite recreation ground. While the Lancastrians remained in power, Pennington set the Commonalty at defiance, but no sooner had the King's true liegemen of Kent won the battle of Northampton, than "the said William Pennington was summarily beheaded nigh unto the same ground, because of the grudge which the City had against him."

It is recorded that in the Reign of Edward I, a gibbet 50 feet high was erected opposite the Rushmarket, upon which the Earl of Athol, for taking part with Baliol against the English King in the Scottish wars, was hanged, but cut down before he was strangled, in order to have his head hewn off and his body burnt. There was also a second gibbet at the Bullstake, upon which Nicholas Faunt, at one time Mayor of the City, was executed in 1471, for taking part with the insurgent "bastard" Faulconbridge. A third was at Oaten Hills, and a fourth at Well Land, while the Monks of Christchurch erected a fifth for malefactors within their own especial jurisdiction at Hollingbourne. There was a pillory at Butchery Lane, a City stocks, and numerous whipping posts, and in the Burghmote Records are numerous entries for new *cucking* stools.

THE MARTYRS' FIELD.

The martyrs who gave the name to the Martyrs' Field were the 41 Protestant victims of the Marian persecution in Canterbury, the last five of whom, three men and two women, were burnt on the 10th of November, 1558. Just a week later Queen Mary herself died with the fateful word 'Calais' written on her heart. The first to suffer under the reactionary policy adopted by Mary and her advisers was John Rogers, burnt at Smithfield, February 4th, 1555, and it is calculated that between that date and the end of her reign no less than 288 Protestants expiated at the stake the crime of constancy to their religious convictions. The larger humanity, which owns St. Thomas of Canterbury as a martyr, recognizes also his successor in name and in office, Thomas Cranmer, and his fellow-sufferers, as worthy of the same title. Something, perhaps, of the bitterness with which this ghastly period of our history is regarded by the majority of Englishmen is due to the habit of looking at the history of our island from a purely insular point of view, and shutting out all considerations of contemporary Continental history by which our own, from time to time, has been so profoundly modified. With regard to the days of Queen Mary, certainly no just

estimate can be found of the influences at work in England without taking into account the momentous events that were then taking place over sea.

Philip, heir-apparent to the Emperor Charles V., married Mary on July 25th, 1554, his father at that time having made him King of Milan and Duke of Naples, in order that his technical rank might not be lower than that of his sovereign English bride. On October 25th, 1555, the Emperor retired from the empire to the cloister, and Philip became King of Spain and the Netherlands, practically at that time the most powerful of European monarchs. In the meanwhile, Pope Julius III died March 23rd, 1555, and, after the 22 days' papacy of Marcellus II, was succeeded on May 26th, 1555, by Pope Paul IV. Paul (Caraffa) was a Neapolitan, and his deadly hatred of Spain and the empire, Charles V and Philip II, was, perhaps, his nearest approach to religion.

Now, in the feud between Philip II and the Pope it was of primary importance to both to secure the adhesion of England. For a time it seemed evident to both that which ever of the two could make sure of England would be successful in the great struggle. But the England which both hoped to enlist was not a Protestant England. The first object of both was to bring back England into the fold of Rome, and both, in apparent agreement, but in reality, in the bitterest hostility, strained every nerve to bring about this consummation before entering on what each regarded as the final Armageddon. Of the statesmen surrounding Mary, the majority were on the side of Philip, but an influential minority were on the side of Paul, while, politically, for the time being, the Protestants were only just strong enough to invite the persecution of both the predominant parties. It would be out of place here to enter into the history of the times, but the visitor to the Martyrs' Field, to whatever church he may belong, may perhaps be glad to be reminded that the ghastly persecution, of which it now possesses a memorial in the appropriate form of a Canterbury Cross, was the outcome of political complications abroad quite as much as of religious intolerance at home.

THE HOSPITALS,

Once far more celebrated and numerous, still exist in many cases to the present day as Almshouses. Among the more important may be mentioned

THE HOSPITAL OF ST. JOHN

In Northgate Street, originally founded by Archbishop Lanfranc in 1084, for the lame, weak, and infirm, still provides a home for 12 brothers and 13 sisters. This ancient hospital, one of the most picturesque buildings in Canterbury, with its half-timbered gateway and room over, and its 16th century kitchen and dining hall, will well repay a visit. Here can still be seen the old open fireplace with its ancient spits exactly as it was three centuries ago, and in the dining hall sets of old pewter, dishes, plates, and flagons, wooden mazers and platters, and rich old Tudor carving. Visitors can always be admitted on application to the Sub-Prior.

ST. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL,

Called, like the great Hospital in London, after St. Thomas of Canterbury, but sometimes known as Eastbridge or Kingsbridge Hospital, is supposed by Somner to have been founded by St. Thomas himself. It was endowed by Archbishop Hubert Walter about the year 1200, and received from William Cokyn the Hospital which he had founded in St. Peter's Street, the union of the two being confirmed by a Bull from Pope Innocent III in 1203. It was suppressed in the reign of Edward VI, and passing into the hands of the King, it was used at the time of the surrender of Calais as a hospital for the sick and wounded of the garrison. After various vicissitudes, the Hospital was refounded by Archbishop Parkes in 1569, only to be again plundered and sold. It owes its present existence to Archbishop Whitgift, who recovered its

property and gave it new statutes. It consists of a vaulted hall, from which the refectory is reached by a few steps ; a chapel, till lately used as a school ; and a series of chambers used by the Brothers and Sisters. A 13th century wall painting was discovered here in 1879. A part of it represents the Martyrdom of St. Thomas and the penance of King Henry at the shrine in the Cathedral. Five Brothers and Five Sisters still receive their lodging here, and about £30 a year each, while an equal number of Out-brothers and Out-sisters receive nearly the same sum.

JESUS HOSPITAL OR THE BOYS' SPITAL,

Also in Northgate Street, was founded by Sir John Boys at the end of the 16th century, and still houses a warden, seven brothers and four sisters. The Hospitals of St. James and St. Lawrence, both founded in the 12th century, for lepers, have long ceased to exist. The name of the latter, however, still lives in the famous St. Lawrence Cricket Ground, where during Canterbury Cricket Week it is no uncommon occurrence to see from 15 to 20 thousand people watching the chief County Matches.

THE HOSPITAL OF ST. NICHOLAS,

Founded by Archbishop Lanfranc in 1084, and giving shelter to nine brothers and seven sisters, is situated at Harbledown, on the great London Road beyond Westgate. Here it was that the Canterbury Pilgrims, on their way to the Shrine of St. Thomas, halted to give alms and possibly to drink at the Black Prince's Well before continuing their pilgrimage. Here Erasmus and Dean Colet were shown the upper leather of a shoe of St. Thomas, "bound with a brazen rim, in which is a piece of glass resembling a jewel," and here to-day may be seen a large mazer with possibly the same "piece of glass" set at the bottom ; and an ancient alms box, probably the same as that into which Erasmus and countless thousands dropped their offerings in

pre-Reformation days. The view of the Cathedral and city from Harbledown is strikingly beautiful.

It may here be noted that the number of beneficiaries assisted by the various Municipal charities in Canterbury at the present day is more than 900. The great majority of these, however, are only recipients of coals, blankets, clothing, boots, etc. ; forty-four receive a pension of £10 a year, but there are very few other actual payments in money.

THE JEWRY.

The Jews of Canterbury were never so numerous as those of London, York, Lincoln, Cambridge, and other cities, but they were evidently an influential section of the community during the greater part of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The Jewry, or Jew's quarter, was situated near High Street and White Horse Lane, and a part of the old synagogue, or, perhaps, of the school, existed until quite recent times in the stone parlour of the old Saracen's Head Inn. Nothing, however, now remains to distinguish the Canterbury Ghetto beyond the name of Jewry Lane. The early history of the Jews in Canterbury is fragmentary and obscure, but it is quite possible that the city itself is referred to in one of the most beautiful passages in mediæval Jewish literature, written by Abraham Ibn Ezra, the "Rabbi Ben Ezra" of Robert Browning's poem, a celebrated Spanish Jew who visited England in the year 1158. The work in which it occurs was written in London, but it is clear that the passage refers not to London, but to some city in which he had sojourned on his way, and Canterbury is the one in which he would be likely to make his longest stay. It runs thus: "It was in the year 4919 (1158), at midnight, on Sabbath eve, the 14th of Tebeth (December 7th), that I, Abraham Ibn Ezra, a Spaniard, was in one of the cities of the island called the 'corner of the earth' (Angle-land, or England), for that it is the last of the seven divisions of the inhabited earth. And I was sleeping, and my sleep was pleasant to me. And I looked in my dream, and behold, beside me stood one in the semblance of a man. And he spake unto me and said :

‘Take this letter that the Sabbath sendeth unto thee.’ And I bowed down my head and worshipped the Lord and blessed the Lord. . . . And I laid hold upon it with my two hands, and my hands dropped with myrrh. And I read it, and in the beginning it was as honey for sweetness. . . . From the day that I knew the Lord, which created us, and learnt His commandments, I have ever loved the Sabbath. Before she came, I was wont to go out to meet her, and when she departed I was fain to speed her with gladness and singing.”

Of the Jews of Canterbury themselves, Aaron, who was Rabbi before 1189, finds a place in Hebrew records as one of the learned, and Rabbi Benjamin seems to have been a worthy predecessor or successor in the charge of the little community which Mr. Jacobs, to whose work on “the Jews of Angevin England,” I am indebted for the foregoing extract, estimates at only twelve individuals at the end of the 12th century. In the next century, for a few years from about 1230, when a clearer glimpse of them is obtainable, they must evidently have been considerably more numerous. At this period, a certain Peter de Bindinges, who appears in the Hebrew versions of the documents connected with his case as “Pirash de Bendigash,” got into money difficulties and applied to the Jews, the mediaeval bankers, for assistance. Nearly all the law-papers relating to him and his fortunes are printed in the sixth volume of the *Archæologia Cantiana*, and are interesting, not only as throwing light on the Jewish community at the time, but as illustrating several peculiarities in the tenures of lands in Kent. In the first instance, Peter makes over his Manor of Westwell to the Prior and Convent of Christchurch for a sum of £171 17s. and the Manor of Little Chart at a rent of ten marks a year. This deed is made in the presence of Stephen Langton, who died in 1229, so that it cannot be later than this year.

By 1233, Peter is five marks in arrear with his rent, and in 1234 he borrows 44s. of Mossekin (Moses) Crespin, son of Jacob, and agrees to pay twopence a week for every pound, if it is not repaid by a certain date, pledging all his lands and chattels as security. Before the end of the year,

he borrows of Benedict (Barachyah) Crespin and his brother Jacob, 100s. for ten years, at the same rate of interest, and in March, 1235, he acknowledges a debt of £9 to Jacob Crespin, to be repaid with interest at Mid-Lent.

In 1236 comes the great crash, when Peter confirms to "Bonamicus, the Jew of Canterbury," the Manor of Little Chart at a quit-rent of a pound of pepper a year in return for a sum down of £200. Among the witnesses to this deed are Samson, son of Aaron, and Cresselin, the son of Hakelin (Isaac). The next year, apparently in accordance with some arrangement between the Jews and the monks, Peter gives the Manor of Little Chart to the Prior and convent of Christchurch for 200 marks, to relieve him from the debts by which "he was held bound in the Jewry." There are no Jew witnesses to this deed, but there are five other deeds seemingly all about contemporary with it, which record that Benedict Crespin individually, Benedict and Jacob Crespin jointly, and Isaac, son of Benedict, and Jacob, son of Isaac, and Aaron Blund, of London, Josce or Joseph, son of Moses, and Moses, son of Jacob, one and all renounce any claim they may have against Peter on account of the Manor of Little Chart, in the twenty-first year of "Aronicus, son of King John" (Henry III), 1237.

Not very long afterwards Peter died leaving a widow Burgia. Burgia, evidently believing that the Manor of Westwell was gavelkind, sued the priory for one-half of it as her free-bench or dowry. Judgment, clearly correct, was given against her, and she subsequently sued for one-third of the Manor as dower, thereby admitting that it was not gavelkind. The dispute was finally settled by a compromise, the priory allowing her a corody for life in lieu of her "widow's third" of the Manor. A corody was an allowance of food and clothing, and in this case the corody allowed was that of a monk and a man-servant. Burgia was more fortunate in her claim on the Manor of Everlond-in-Ash, which was only partly held by knight's service, the remainder being in gavelkind. She sued for her third of the former part and her half of the latter, and succeeded in her claim.

Throughout these transactions the Canterbury Jews seem to have behaved at least as liberally as the Prior and Convent of Christ Church. The rate of interest demanded, about 43 per cent., seems high in these days, but the loans were small, the times were troublous, and it further seems as if interest did not begin to run until after the time agreed on for repayment had passed. There are instances, it is true, on record of loans from Jews elsewhere at a rate as low as one penny a week per pound, but there are also others at threepence, and the commonest rate of all is fourpence, or nearly 87 per cent. per annum.

King John seems to have dealt with the property of the Canterbury Jews as freely as with that of others elsewhere. To the Earl of Surrey he gave a house in the Jewry at London, belonging to Isaac and his brother at Canterbury, while on Abram, the cross-bowman, probably himself a Jew, he bestowed the house in Canterbury of Isaac, the son of Jacob, and Bona, his wife. This, however, was only his way of showing that he regarded the Jewries as Royal preserves. On an outbreak of anti-Semitic rioting in London, he writes to the Mayor expressing his amazement at the impudence of the citizens in molesting his own people. "You know," he says, "that the Jews are under our special protection. If we had granted our protection to a dog, it ought to be inviolably observed."

Whether any Canterbury Jews were executed by Edward I, when "of the Jews of both sexes there were hanged in London 280, and a very great multitude in the other cities of England," on the false charge of clipping coin, does not appear. The last of them were among the 16,000 who were banished from our shores in the summer of 1290, the victims of a persecution more bloody, but less criminal, than that with which their descendants are visited at the close of the 19th century in lands that boast of their civilization.

CHRISTCHURCH GATE,

At the end of Mercery Lane and the chief entrance to the Monastery of Christchurch and the Cathedral, was built on the site of the Norman gateway in 1517, by Prior Goldstone. Though damaged by time, and mutilated in 1648 by the religious maniac, Richard Culmer, this gateway still remains one of the most beautiful specimens of perpendicular work in the country. The battlements were removed in the present century to allow some residents in the vicinity to see the time by the Cathedral clock.

THE PALACE OF THE ARCHBISHOPS.

Built originally by Archbishop Lanfranc near the site of the Saxon Palace given by King Ethelbert to St. Augustine, the ancient Palace has long ceased to exist except in name. The stately hall, commenced by Archbishop Hubert Walter, finished by Archbishop Stephen Langton, and paid for by Archbishop Boniface, was pulled down during the Commonwealth, as, after it had been plundered by the Puritans, was a great part of the Palace. What remained was converted into private houses, and though, after the restoration, what remained of the Palace with its precincts was disgorged, it has never been restored till the present day ; nor has any Archbishop of Canterbury resided in his own Metropolitan City. Happily, after so long an interval, a new Palace, which will include a portion of the old, is now in course of construction, and when complete will again be the permanent home of our Archbishops. Across a thousand years the Kentish "Eternal City" looks back to-day with pride on the hallowed friendship of a Plegmund and an Alfred. At the close of another thousand years may she remember with not less gratitude and reverence the names of a Temple and a Victoria.

In September, 1299, after the marriage of the King of England with the sister of the King of France, a

most sumptuous feast was kept here for four days together, most of the English and French nobles being present.

In 1520 a splendid ball was celebrated in the great Hall on one of the nights in Whitsun week, when the newly-elected Emperor Charles V. danced with the Queen of England, and the King of England with the Queen of Arragon. This was followed by a Royal feast, at which the Duke of Buckingham was server.

In 1573 Queen Elizabeth kept her birthday at Canterbury, and the Archbishop gave a sumptuous banquet.

THE GUILDHALL,

or Court House, as it was called in the last century, and known previous to the reign of Henry VI as the Speech House, stands at the corner of High Street and Guildhall Street. It was rebuilt in its present form early in the last century, and though not devoid of interest, is now totally inadequate for the purposes for which it is required. It contains a few curious portraits, notably those of John Cogan, by Jansen, and Sir John Boys. There is also a small array of arms, including some pikes removed from Lady Wooton's house at St. Augustine's in 1641, when the City was fortified "at the common charge." How frequent these charges must have been at the time of the Civil Wars, and how severely they must have been felt by the citizens, may be gathered from the entries in the Burgmote Records, which tell of many such assessments on the citizens to provide soldiers, ships, and powder. In 1634, King Charles I. makes demand for a Ship of War to be set forth at the expense of the citizens. In 1638 a cess is levied on the city to purchase powder "for its defence in these perilous times." In the following year, the citizens are taxed towards raising an army for His Majesty against the Scots, on which occasion the City furnished 80 soldiers. The following year it was compelled to send 56 more, and to find sundry carters and horses. Cromwell, who evidently had a grudge against the Royalist City which had raised the cry "For God, The King, and Kent," compelled

the citizens three years later to provide one hundred horse soldiers, though they had already sent one hundred and twenty men to Dover Castle, and £2,600 in money to London. At this time Canterbury was in the hands of the Roundheads, and the importance of preserving it is manifest from the fact that the Parliament at Westminster expended £400 in strengthening the fortifications of the City.

MARKETS AND FAIRS.

The poultry and butter market, formerly held outside Christchurch Gate, the fish market near the church of St. Mary Fishman, the bread market by St. Mary Bredman, and the oat market on Oaten Hill, where public executions took place, and the wine market supposed to have been held in Wincheap, all still survive in name, while Mercery Lane, still one of the most picturesque streets in England, and Butchery Lane, are left to tell of the commodities for which they were formerly famed. Of the Canterbury Fairs only one is still continued, the old Michaelmas Fair, called, while still a statute Fair, "Jack and Joan Fair." King Richard II, moved by respect for the Church in which his father, Edward the Black Prince, was buried, granted four Fairs to the Prior and Convent of Christ Church to be held in every year. These Fairs, which were held within the Cemetery Gate, have only been discontinued in comparatively recent times. Of the Fair granted by the charter of Charles II mention has been already made.

INNS.

"At The Chekers of the Hope that every man doth know," some of the remains of this famous Inn may still be seen at the South-West Corner of Mercery Lane. The vaulted ceiling still to be seen in the present shop is still as it was in Chaucer's time. The inn was originally built in the form of a quadrangle with an open courtyard, and the rooms, reached from a staircase outside, projected one over the other, the first floor being supported on pillars which formed a colonnade.

Near the ancient Chequers in the High Street is the "Crown," now no longer an inn, though once of great repute and extensive accommodation. It can be easily recognised by the highly embossed figures which ornament the street front. The upper floor is now used as one of the Municipal offices. A richly-ornamented Elizabethan ceiling is to be seen on the first floor. Other old Inns still retaining something of their old-world character, are—The Angel in St. Margaret's Street, the Fleur de Lys in High Street, The Rose in St. George's Street, and The Star and the Falstaff Tavern in St. Dunstan's Street; the last distinguished by a beautiful and elaborate wrought iron support for the painted sign.

TRADES.

The weaving of silks, velvets, and brocades, and the manufacture of cloth and woollen stuffs which, at the end of the 17th century, employed 1,000 looms and 2,700 persons in Canterbury alone, owed their existence almost entirely to the Walloon and French refugees who settled in the City at the time of the great religious persecutions in the Netherlands and France. These "strangers," amounting in 1630 to 1,300 persons, and after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to considerably more than double that number, were granted numerous privileges, and were permitted to exercise their various trades without being enforced to purchase their "freedom." To them Canterbury owes much of its prosperity in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, and some idea of the high estimation in which its manufactures were once held may be gathered from Hasted's account of his visit in 1787 to Mr. Calloway's silk looms, where he saw the richest and most beautiful piece of silk furniture made for the Prince of Wales's Palace at Carlton House that ever was made in this or any other kingdom. This same merchant, besides silk weaving, introduced the weaving of cotton into the city, and the famous "Canterbury muslins" were at one time celebrated throughout the country.—Since

the beginning of the century the character of the old industries has almost entirely changed. With the exception of a few looms still used for weaving linen, hand weaving has almost entirely disappeared. A successful weaving school has, however, been recently started in High Street. Of the other old Canterbury trades, among which may be mentioned the manufacture of Canterbury brawn, tanning, and brewing are still in a prosperous condition.

THE KING'S SCHOOL,

situated in the Mint Yard, may justly claim to be the oldest of our English public schools. It is certain that Archbishop Theodore, in the 7th century, founded a school within the City of Canterbury wherein he placed professors of all the liberal sciences, and there is no doubt that Canterbury was the great centre of learning at least 200 years before King Alfred is said to have founded the school at Oxford. The present school, refounded by Henry VIII in 1541 for 50 King's Scholars, formed an integral portion of the Cathedral foundation. It was re-organized in 1879 by the Charity Commissioners. Among the many eminent men who have been educated here may be mentioned Christopher Marlowe, Richard Boyle "the great Earl of Cork," Accepted Frewen, Archbishop of York, Lord Chief Justice Tenterden, William Harvey, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, and Sir Andrew Clark.

THE ROYAL MUSEUM AND FREE LIBRARY,

both belonging to the Corporation are now permanently housed in the new building of the Beaney Institute, recently completely from designs by the City Surveyor, Mr. A. H. Campbell. The building, which has a handsome half-timbered front facing High Street, near the Guildhall, has been partially paid for out of a legacy of £10,000 left to the City by the late Mr. Beaney, a native of Canterbury, who amassed a large fortune in Australia. According to the terms of his will, a number of his portraits were ordered to

be hung in a conspicuous part of the building, and he originally intended that the money which he left to the City should be used to found an institute for the education of working-men. The Corporation, however, with the consent of the Charity Commissioners, have wisely added another five thousand pounds to the original sum, and erected the present building for the purposes of the already existing Free Library and Museum. By special permission of Her Majesty the Queen, the Museum, which has been in existence since 1825, is now styled the Royal Museum.

It occupies the whole of the first floor of the new building, as well as a large room in the half basement used for the natural history collections, and is fitted throughout with electric light. The 18th century chandelier in the large room was originally from the Cathedral. The mahogany cases with which the Museum is fitted were formerly in the British Museum ; they have been rebuilt by Messrs. Cubitt and Co., and were paid for partly out of a legacy left to the museum by the late Miss Lawrence, and partly out of a gift of one hundred pounds given by W. Oxenden Hammond, Esq., of St. Albans Court, who has taken a particular interest in the Museum.

The Museum, though not on a large scale, contains many objects of remarkable rarity. Besides the Geological and Natural History Collections not yet arranged, the Museum contains a small ethnological collection, which includes three eligible specimens of Maori tatooed heads. Upstairs particular attention may be drawn to the collections of prehistoric implements, Roman and Anglo-Saxon antiquities found in Canterbury and Thanet and East Kent. Special notice should be taken of two Rune-stones found at Sandwich. The name, which has been read RÆHÆBUL, is incised on the larger stone. Nothing is now perceptible on the smaller one, though both were probably inscribed with the names of those in whose memory they were erected. Professor Stephens, in his Old Northern Runic Monuments, considers these stones unique, and that they belong to the fourth or fifth century ; being probably the oldest funeral blocks ever found in this country not belonging to a Celtic or Romano-British population. A nearly perfect specimen of an

Anglo-Saxon glass vessel, with hollow, tear-like protuberances, from Reculver, is to be seen in the same room.

Near the central window is

ST. AUGUSTINE'S CHAIR,

formerly in the chancel of the Church of Stanford Bishop, in Herefordshire. This chair is believed to be the one in which St. Augustine was seated when he received the British Bishops at Augustine's Oak. It was turned out of the church during the restorations many years ago, and was acquired by the late Dr. James Johnston, who had been aware of its existence and the tradition concerning it some forty years previously. It was presented to the Royal Museum in 1899, by his son, G. Cocks Johnston, Esq., of Cheltenham. Close by is a 14th century chair taken from the Cathedral of Notre Dame at Rouen during the Revolution. This chair was originally in a well-known collection in Paris, and is lent by the Hon. Curator.

Among other objects of interest in the same room may be mentioned the ancient Burghmote horn with which the Corporation, down to the year 1835, were wont to be assembled. Mention of this horn is made in the reign of Henry III, when, in an action of trespass brought by the Abbot of St. Augustine's against the citizens, the bailiffs are accused of raising the Commonalty by the sound of the horn to the number of 5,000, in order to commit an outrage on the Abbot's property in revenge for a supposed invasion of the rights of the City by the Abbot. In the same case may be seen the historic silver maces of the now extinct Corporation of Fordwich, with some other specimens of ancient metal work. The cases at the end of the room contain a collection of Old English earthenware and porcelain, which includes many interesting specimens of Old Lambeth and other English Delft ware, lent by the Hon. Curator.

In the room adjoining may be seen the loan exhibition of ecclesiastical and other art from the Victoria and Albert

Museum, and in the small room may be seen the celebrated Tinworth terra-cottas and a collection of modern Lambeth ware, kindly lent by Messrs. Doulton and Co. On the walls are two representative pictures by the well-known Canterbury artist, Sidney Cooper, R.A., and at the end of the large room a full-length portrait of the Princess Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, and daughter of James I, by Vandyke, [Mr. J. van Miereveldt?] and one of the original studies in oil of the "Wheel of Fortune," by Sir Edward Burde Jones, Bart., lent by the Hon. Curator. The Museum possesses an almost complete collection of engravings and prints of old Canterbury, presented by Dr. Pugin Thornton, and in the library there are about forty similar prints presented by J. Henniker Heaton, Esq., M.P. In addition to these, the Museum is rich in engravings, the valuable Ingram collection of old Italian engravings and drawings having been presented last year by Ingram Godfrey, Esq., of Brooke House.

THE FREE LIBRARY,

Founded in 1857, and fitted with all modern improvements, has been entirely furnished at the expense of Joshua Cox, Esq., a citizen of Canterbury, who presented a thousand guineas for the purpose. There is a large reading-room, on the walls of which is a collection of savage and other arms, a magazine room, in which the various Colonial portraits of Dr. Beaney are displayed to the best advantage, and a lending and reference library. The last contains some valuable topographical works, and by an arrangement with the East Kent Natural History Society this valuable and extensive library is now kept in the Corporation building. The Reference Library has lately received many valuable gifts, notably, two hundred guineas from the well-known benefactor to the city, Alderman George Collard, Esq., J.P., Mayor of Canterbury. This money is to be expended on the purchase of books relating to Kent and Canterbury.

THE SIDNEY COOPER SCHOOL OF ART,

Founded by Thomas Sidney Cooper, Esq., R.A., and situated in High Street, deservedly holds a high position among similar institutions.

[A complete list of all works relating to Canterbury, together with much additional matter which would be out of place in the present necessarily brief summary will be included in the General Handbook to Canterbury which the Editors hope shortly to publish.]

Men of Kent, remember ye,
Like your sires of old to be,
Foremost of our English free !

